

JPRS-TAC-86-056

16 JULY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-056

16 JULY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR Supreme Soviet Discusses Reagan SALT II Decision (Various sources, various dates)	1
Foreign Affairs Commissions' Resolution	1
Further Report	2
Ligachev, Others on SALT II	7
IZVESTIYA Commentary, by Melor Sturua	16
USSR: NATO Halifax Meeting Discusses U.S. SALT II Stance (Various sources, various dates)	19
U.S. Stance Causes 'Alarm', by Yuriy Soltan	19
'Irritation' With U.S. Noted, by Boris Kalyagin	20
Allies Oppose U.S. SALT II Stance, by Boris Kalyagin	20
U.S. Seeks 'Supremacy'	21
'Frank Dissatisfaction' Seen, by Boris Kalyagin	22
Concluding Document Criticized	23
USSR Initiatives 'Ignored'	24
'Cracks' in NATO Solidarity, by Vladimir Shelkov	25
USSR: U.S. House of Representatives Backs SALT II Compliance (Various sources, various dates)	26
Foreign Affairs Committee	26
Full House	26
House, Senate Bills	26
Zholkver Comments, by Aleksandr Zholkver	27

USSR: Allies' Reaction to Reagan SALT II Decision Assessed (Moscow TASS, 6 Jun 86; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 6, 9 Jun 86)	29
DER STERN Cited	29
Canadian Arms Control Center, by Nikolay Borin	30
U.S.-Europe 'Split', by Aleksey Grigoriyev	31
Finland's Leading Paper Criticizes U.S. SALT-II Stand (Editorial, Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 1 Jun 86)	32
Paper Proposes Finnish Government Initiate SALT Conference (Editorial, Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 8 Jun 86)	33
NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
Soviet Paper Raps Perle, Adelman Calls for Continued Testing (N. Novlyanskiy; Moscow GUDOK, 16 May 86)	35
RELATED ISSUES	
USSR: Warsaw Pact Proposal, Reagan SALT II Decision Contrasted (M. Ponomarev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 15 Jun 86)	37
Moscow Talk Show: Warsaw Pact Proposals, INF, SDI (Pavel Kasparov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 13 Jun 86)	41
Moscow Talk Show: Warsaw Pact Proposals, SALT II (Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 15 Jun 86)	46
Moscow Talk Show: Pact Proposals, Geneva Talks, SALT II (Vadim Borisovich Kassis, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 22 Jun 86)	54
PRAVDA on Physicians Against Nuclear War Cologne Congress (T. Kolesnichenko, Yu. Yakhontov; Moscow PRAVDA, 2 Jun 86)	59
USSR: Physicians Against Nuclear War Leaders Visit PRC (S. Kuznetsov; Moscow TRUD, 11 Jun 86)	62
USSR's Bovin Views Global Nuclear War Consequences (A. Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 16 Jun 86)	63
Moscow Patriarch Writes Letter to Reagan on Nuclear Arms (Patriarch Pimen; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 14 Jun 86)	66
Soviet Book on Ecological Effects of Nuclear, Chemical War (D. N. Lyalikov; Moscow OБSHCHESTVENNNYE NAUKI V SSSR: SERIYA 1--PROBLEMY NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA, No 4, Jul-Aug 85)	69

TASS Marks Anniversary of Nuclear War Prevention Agreement (Moscow TASS, 20 Jun 86)	73
USSR's Trofimenko Outlines Dangers of 'Military Atom' (Genrikh Trofimenko; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 21, 2 Jun 86) ...	75
TASS Reports Speech by FRG's Johannes Rau (Moscow TASS, 30 May 86)	79
CPSU's Dobrynin Speaks on Arms Issues, U.S.-Soviet Relations (A.F. Dobrynin; Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 21 May 86)	80
CPSU's Dobrynin Writes on Disarmament, Development (Anatoliy Dobrynin; Paris LE MONDE, 4 Jun 86)	85
Briefs	
TASS Cites PRC's Hu	87
CPSU Disarmament Brochure	87

/7310

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR SUPREME SOVIET DISCUSSES REAGAN SALT II DECISION

Foreign Affairs Commissions' Resolution

LD201551 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)--The Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet at their joint session today considered the state of the Soviet-American agreements on the limitation of strategic arms as a result of the U.S. Government's actions.

Having heard in this connection the reports by the Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs of the USSR and the report by the deputies' preparatory group which studied how the relevant Soviet ministries and departments handled the questions of complying with and monitoring compliance with the above-mentioned Soviet-American agreements, the commissions declare that the U.S. Government's decision to stop observing in the future the 1972 interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT-I) and the 1979 treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT-II) represents a very dangerous step along the way of disrupting the entire existing regime of arms restrictions and undermining the possibilities of concluding in the future further-going agreements in this field;

Point out that this decision is a direct continuation of the U.S. Administration's overall destructive approach to problems of restricting and reducing armaments, which rests on the striving to achieve military superiority;

Reject as groundless and having malicious aims the U.S. Administration's attempts to ascribe violations of the SALT-2 Treaty and other Soviet-American agreements to the Soviet Union;

Draw attention of all Soviet ministries and departments concerned to the importance of continuing scrupulous compliance with the provisions, still in force, of the Soviet-American agreements in the field of limiting strategic arms as long as the American side complies with them.

The Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet express particular concern over the fact that the American side is undertaking steps that are also leading to undermining the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. This threatens to finally destroy the foundation on which strategic stability can only rest, and to pave the way for an unchecked arms race.

To discuss mutual concerns of the Soviet and the American parliamentarians in connection with the Soviet-American agreements on the limitation of strategic arms, it is proposed to hold shortly a working meeting between members of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress. Given the importance of the question of ending nuclear tests, this issue can also be discussed at the proposed meeting.

Such meetings could become regular, and their participants could exchange views both of questions related to the observance of the existing agreements and the elaboration of new agreements.

Mindful of the serious situation that is taking shape...the situation fraught with grave consequences for the destinies of peace -- the members of the foreign affairs commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. are urging the members of the corresponding commissions of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the U.S. congress, just as all other members of the U.S. Congress, to do everything within their capabilities to see to it that the Government of the U.S. observe the Soviet-American SALT-I and SALT-II agreements and refrain from actions undermining the ABM Treaty.

The commissions also express the hope that the U.S. Government itself will weigh another time all the consequences of its announced intention to renounce the treaties, and will take the decisions that would make it possible to stop the process of mankind's sliding into a nuclear catastrophe.

Proceeding from the premise that an outbreak of nuclear conflict would constitute a lethal threat not only to the U.S.S.R. and the U.S., but also to all other countries, the commissions consider it to be extremely important that the parliamentarians unequivocally express their desire to avert the threat looming dark over our planet and oblige their governments to pursue an active policy of peace, disarmament and negotiated settlement of disputes.

The foreign affairs commissions of the Soviet of the UNION and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., fully aware of the complexity of the present moment, at the same time express the conviction that the peoples of the world are capable of safeguarding the peace, terminating the arms race and beginning the establishment of a dependable and comprehensive system of international security. Security for all -- the West and the East, the North and the South, the states big and small, irrespective of the religious beliefs, ideological persuasions, and political views of their citizens.

Further Report

LD201752 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS -- A joint session of the foreign affairs commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet took place in the Kremlin today. The parliamentarians examined the situation taking shape with regard to the Soviet-American accords on the limitation of strategic arms as a consequence of actions taken by the U.S. administration.

Participants in the meeting included Yegor Ligachev, a Member of the Politbureau, secretary of the CPSU Central committee and Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union, Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, and Mikhail Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The meeting was attended by Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme SOVIET, Avgust Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Tengiz Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and heads of a number of ministries, departments and public organizations.

The session was chaired by Yegor Ligachev. He stressed that the question submitted for the consideration of the deputies-members of the foreign affairs commissions had acquired special urgency because of the decision recently announced by the U.S. President no longer to comply with the Soviet-U.S. agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive arms.

The U.S. administration announced that those agreements were outdated, that they had been done in and no longer exist. Washington proceeds from the assumption that the restrictions imposed by the agreements stand in the way of the runaway arms build-up and the achievement of military superiority by the USA over the Soviet Union. The arms race is generating fabulous profits for the monopolies, the military-industrial complex, and this is one of the main causes of stockpiling of ever new mountains of armaments.

The Soviet Union takes a fundamentally different stand on arms limitation and reduction, the chairman said. It is well known: We stand for ending the race with armaments, both strategic and all the others, for lowering the level of armed confrontation and for the provision of conditions to rule out nuclear war.

To put an end to the arms race and go over to real disarmament, the Soviet Union tabled a series of proposals within a short period of time.

First. Termination of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union unilaterally introduced a moratorium on nuclear explosions and put forward the proposal immediately to begin talks on a total nuclear test ban.

Second. Total elimination of nuclear arms by the end of the current century with the prevention of the development of space strike weapons (SDI).

Third. Elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe.

Fourth. Elimination of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production already during this century.

Fifth. Reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Sixth. International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space for the good of the whole of mankind.

Seventh. Dependable verification at every stage of disarmament with the use of both national means and international procedures, to the point of and including on-site inspections.

Eighth. Establishment of a comprehensive system of the international security of the peoples, embracing military, political, economic and humanitarian field.

The U.S. Administration is ignoring the peace proposals of the Soviet Union and responded to them with acts of aggression against Libya and fresh acts of provocation in Nicaragua, the Middle East, Angola and Afghanistan.

The conference of socialist countries in Budapest this June reaffirmed these guidelines for the struggle waged by the fraternal countries for peace and for a switchover to real disarmament. They have now become the foreign policy platform of all the countries of the socialist community. The June 1986 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee approved the activities of our delegation at the conference and reiterated the Party's foreign policy course, mapped out by the 27th CPSU Congress, for stronger international security and for the prevention of the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union has been consistently standing for the strict observance of earlier agreements on arms limitation and reduction. The Soviet Union has not done anything since the ABM Treaty and interim agreement were concluded in 1973 and the SALT-2 Treaty in 1979 that would be contrary to the stipulations of those accords.

The violation of agreements and cancellation of signed accords is not Soviet policy. Any attempts taken by Washington to present things differently are intended to create an atmosphere in which it would find it easier itself to renege on the agreements concluded earlier and to rationalize an arms buildup. The U.S. ruling circles, launching a new arms race, are hoping to drag the Soviet Union into it, to exhaust us economically, to detract from our influence on the cause of peace and social progress and to regain their lost positions.

The United States took an action which is subverting the very process of arms limitation and reduction. It is a very dangerous path and if the United States continues to follow it the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, concluded in perpetuity, could become the next victim of American militarism.

If this happens, strategic stability in the world would be further impaired and the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war would grow many-fold.

This explains the worry caused by the irresponsible actions of the American administration in the USA itself, including in Congress, and among U.S. allies, let alone the world public. Incidentally, one is getting the impression that the talks conducted in Geneva, Stockholm and Vienna the USA would like to use as a cover for the arms race.

Naturally, the logic of today's international relations is such, Yegor Ligachev stressed, that the actions of the USA to upset the existing rough military-strategic parity are bound to provoke an adequate counteraction on the Soviet part. He recalled the warning made to the American side to this effect in the statement of the Soviet Government on May 31 in connection with the U.S. renunciation of the accords on strategic offensive arms.

The Soviet Union is firmly retaining the initiative in the struggle for peace, in the offensive on the forces of war. Mikhail Gorbachev said in the political report to the Party Congress that "under all circumstances success must be achieved in the battle to prevent war. This would be an epoch-making victory of the whole of humanity, of every person on earth. The CPSU sees active participation in this battle as the essence of its foreign policy strategy."

In the light of the situation now taking shape in the matter of compliance with the Soviet-American accords on the limitation of strategic weapons, the chairman said, it is necessary to consider in the most careful manner the entire complex of problems arising in this context and to draw practical conclusions.

Reports on the matter under consideration were made by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, first deputy minister of defence of the USSR and chief of the General Staff of the Soviet armed forces, and Yuliy Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

Sergey Akhromeyev noted the special place of the Soviet-American SALT-1 Treaty, including the ABM treaty, and SALT-2 Treaty in arms limitation and disarmament. He cited numerous facts of U.S. violations of its commitments under the above agreements. As regards the ABM Treaty, the gravest danger is presented by the U.S. "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) programme. As for the SALT-2 Treaty, the so-called "comprehensive strategic programme," approved by the USA in 1981, is in conflict with it.

At the same time the Soviet Union, the speaker stressed, is taking in all seriousness its commitments and that is why we not only are taking measures to preclude the possibility of even an inadvertent deviation from the stipulations of the agreements but also clarify the questions asked by the American side. However, it is clear that the attitude of the Soviet side to the SALT accords cannot be defined without regard for the actions of the American side.

Yuliy Vorontsov noted in his report that, stating the intention of the USA to go beyond the limitations of the SALT-2 treaty, President Reagan actually unleashed a war against any treaty restrictions on the U.S. military buildup programmes. Washington's decision not to comply any longer with the Soviet-American accords on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments is putting the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons into a very difficult situation. The speaker also drew attention to the dangerous character of the efforts made by the USA to develop ABM systems, which are increasingly coming into conflict with the essence of the U.S. commitments under the ABM Treaty. The American administration, Yuliy Vorontsov said, should give thought to the consequences of its actions and strictly respect the existing agreements.

Deputy Georgiy Korniyenko, a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union, delivered a report on the work done by a deputies' preparatory group which had studied the observance by relevant Soviet ministries and departments of the Soviet-American agreements on strategic arms limitation and verification of observance of these agreements by the other side.

Deputies Georgiy Arbatov, Yevgeniy Velikhov, Natalia Orlova and Aleksandr Subbotin, who spoke in debates, dwelt on various aspects of the matter under consideration. They denounced the U.S. actions in subversion of the process of arms limitation and reduction and strongly demanded from the American administration that measures be taken to rectify the existing situation. They voiced undivided support for the practical actions of the Soviet Government to ensure strict compliance with the existing SALT accords.

The closing speech was delivered by Anatoliy Dobrynin. He stressed that the commissions had taken a justifiable and timely interest in the problem at hand. The very logic of today's development and the realities of the nuclear age are putting into the focus of world politics both the need for restraint in relations between the two major powers, possessing huge potentials of weapons of mass destruction, and the urgent need for limits on their stockpiling and for their eventual elimination. This approach of our party and the Soviet State was reaffirmed by the June plenary meeting of the Central Committee and by the latest session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The foreign affairs commissions, the speaker said, made the firm conclusion that the Soviet Union is respecting its commitments under the treaties. The groundlessness of American claims in this respect was forcefully demonstrated in the speeches of the representatives of the Defence Ministry, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and other comrades at today's session.

The SALT agreements are not to the liking of the more "hawkish" forces in the USA because these agreements are based on the principle of equality and equal security, formalize strategic parity and constitute an obstacle to the fulfilment by the United States of its large-scale military build-up programmes. So when the bounds of treaty limitations had become too narrow for those programmes, the USA merely decided to throw those agreements overboard.

One can say that Washington demonstrated anew its commitment to the ideology and concepts of military superiority, its real lack of interest in international agreements, and its unwillingness or at best lack of readiness to awake to the realities of the nuclear age.

An extremely alarming situation is now taking shape in arms limitation and reduction in general, Anatoliy Dobrynin stressed. The negative effects of the decision of the U.S. Administration to renounce the existing agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive arms are already making themselves felt. The situation at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons has clearly been aggravated. The grave doubts we had even earlier about the real wish of the American side to have new agreements have now been forcefully supported.

In this situation the Soviet Union will counter the dangerous course of the USA with a consistent policy of shaping up international relations that would be adequate to the character of the nuclear-space age, and seek perseveringly and with initiative a way out of the blind alley into which the U.S. extremist forces would like to push the world.

Our country stood and continues to stand for the strict observance of commitments under the existing agreements, for the preservation of everything positive that has been achieved with so much effort in the field of strategic arms limitation. This would be important to the maintenance of the strategic balance and to ensuring auspicious conditions for drafting new agreements on arms limitation and reduction. A good deal, naturally, will depend here on the situation with the prevention of an arms race in space and U.S. compliance with the ABM Treaty.

In today's circumstances it is therefore exceptionally important, the speaker said, that the Government of the United States weigh up anew all responsibility it is incurring by taking the decision which is leading to the ruin of the SALT process and, while there still is time, draw the proper conclusion.

16 July 1986

The U.S. Congress can and must play a role here. We would like to express the hope that U.S. Congress and its members join in the demands that the Government of the United States strictly comply with the existing Soviet-American agreements and refrain from the renunciation of international legal documents supporting the arms limitation process.

Anatoliy Dobrynin seconded the initiative of the deputies' preparatory group for a working meeting of representatives of the relevant commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress to discuss mutual concerns related to the above questions. It seems useful, too, to pass a special resolution of the foreign affairs commissions of the two chambers to reflect our principled evaluation of the current situation with the interim agreement and the SALT-2 treaty.

The foreign affairs commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet passed a resolution on the matter under discussion and decided to send the text of the resolution to the Government of the USA and to U.S. Congress, as well as the parliaments of other countries.

Ligachev, Others on SALT II

LD202149 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1615 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] A joint session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held in the Kremlin today. The session was opened by Yegor Kuznich Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union. He said:

[Being recording] [Ligachev] Esteemed comrade deputies: Today we have to examine the state of affairs as regards observance by the two sides of the Soviet-U.S. agreements in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. As you know, this issue has become particularly acute due to the decision recently announced by the U.S. President to refuse in future to observe the SALT II agreement concluded between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The U.S. Administration stated that, in its opinion, the strategic arms limitation agreements are, allegedly, obsolete, that they are finished with, and that they no longer exist. Washington is proceeding from the fact that the limitations imposed by SALT II hamper the unbridled arms build-up and the attainment by the United States of military superiority over the Soviet Union. Striving to destroy the military and strategic parity, the U.S. ruling circles are attempting to explain this by the alleged existence of a Soviet military threat and a lagging behind the Soviet Union in armaments level. In reality, things are different. The arms race in the United States brings in fantastically large profits for the monopolies and the military-industrial complex. This, primarily, is the reason for the unprecedented stockpiling of mountains of new weapons.

Our country, the Soviet Union, holds a fundamentally different position on issues relating to the limitation and reduction of strategic arms in general, and of all arms. With the aim of ending the arms race and passing on to genuine disarmament, the Soviet Union has put forward a whole range of proposals in a short period of time. First, to end nuclear weapons. [as heard] As is known, the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and, moreover, put forward a proposal for an immediate start to talks on a total ban on nuclear tests. Second, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of this century while preventing the creation of space

strike weapons, and to limit work on the so-called SDI to laboratory research. Third, the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone. Fourth, the elimination this century of chemical weapons and also of the industrial base for the production of chemical weapons. Fifth, the reduction of armed forces and arms in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. Sixth, international cooperation in the utilization of space for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. Seventh, the implementation of reliable monitoring at all stages of disarmament, using both national means and international procedures up to and including on-site inspection. Eighth, the creation of a comprehensive system of international security of the peoples, embracing the military, political, economic and humanitarian spheres.

Our country's peace-loving initiatives are in line with the interests of the Soviet people, the American people, and the other peoples of the world. The Budapest conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member state held in June of this year, confirmed these principal areas of the fraternal countries' struggle for peace and for a transition to genuine disarmament.

We have every reason to say that these have now become the foreign policy platform of all the countries of the socialist community. The recent party Central Committee plenum approved the activity of our delegation at the conference, and confirmed the foreign policy course of the party, as mapped out by the 27th congress, toward strengthening international security and averting the threat of nuclear war.

The question naturally arises: How have the aggressive imperialist circles in the United States responded to all this? The U.S. Administration is keeping quiet about and disregarding the Soviet Union's peaceful proposals. It responded to them by aggressive actions against Libya and new provocations in Nicaragua, the Near East, Angola and Afghanistan.

The Soviet Union, as is known, has consistently advocated and advocates the strictest observation of previously concluded agreements in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. The principle of strict fulfillment of their obligations by the signatory states of agreements is one of the fundamental principles of international law, upon which, as is known, all interstate relations are built.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the aforementioned principle is, for it, a constitutional norm. It is laid down in Article 29 of the USSR Constitution, and, I should like to recall, is worked out in detail in the 6 July 1978 USSR law on the procedure for concluding, implementing and denouncing international agreements. We have always approached our own actions and, of course, the actions of the other country, from an equally strict criterion, and we continue this policy this I would like to stress. The violation of agreements reached and renunciation of agreements signed is not the policy of the Soviet Union.

All attempts by Washington to portray matters, as the saying goes, in another light, are calculated to create an atmosphere in which it would be easier for Washington to re-previousy concluded agreements and to justify the incessant increase of armaments. In unleashing a new arms race, the ruling circles of the United States are hoping to draw our country, the Soviet Union, into it, hoping to exhaust us economically, weaken our influence on the cause of peace and progress, and regain their lost positions. The United States has taken action which undermines the very process of the limitation and reduction of armaments. This is a very dangerous course. And if the United States continues to proceed along this road, the next victim of U.S. militarism could be the

open-ended treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems. It is therefore easy to understand the alarm being engendered by the, bluntly speaking, irresponsible actions of the U.S. Administration, both in the United States, including Congress, and among the U.S. allies, not to mention world public opinion.

Incidentally, one gets the impression that the talks being conducted in Geneva, Vienna and Helsinki are needed by the United States, its aggressive circles, as a screen to cover up a ferocious arms race. Naturally, the U.S. actions to disarm [razoruzheniye] the current military and strategic parity will, without fail, elicit corresponding countermeasures on the Soviet side. I should like to remind you, comrades, that the Soviet Government statement of 1 July [as heard] this year, in connection with the U.S. renunciation of agreements in the sphere of strategic offensive armaments, says bluntly that as soon as the United States exceeds the established arms levels, or in any other way contravenes the other basic provisions of the aforementioned agreements which have hitherto been observed by the countries, the Soviet Union will consider itself released from the relevant obligations, and will respond by adopting the necessary practical steps to prevent the undermining of the military and strategic parity and maintain our country's defense capability at the necessary level.

The Soviet Union firmly holds the initiative in the struggle for peace and in the offensive against the forces of war. In his Political Report at the party congress, Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev indicated that success in the battle against war must be achieved without fail, a success which will be an historic victory for all mankind. The CPSU sees active involvement in this battle as the very essence of its entire foreign policy strategy.

Comrade deputies, in the light of the situation which is currently taking shape as far as the observance of Soviet-U.S. agreements on the limitation of strategic armaments is concerned, we are faced with the need to consider most scrupulously this whole group of problems and other matters arising in this regard, and to make the necessary practical conclusions.

In this connection, we are today putting forward for a discussion a matter which could be roughly phrased as follows: The situation taking shape with regard to Soviet-U.S. agreements on the limitation of strategic armaments as a result of the actions of the United States. Will you have any other wishes, proposals, comrades? [murmurs of "no"]

No. Then let us consider that we have agreed upon the agenda of our joint session.

Allow me to hand the floor to Comrade Sergey Fedorovich Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, first deputy minister of defense.

[Akhromeyev] Comrade chairman of commission, comrade-members of the Foreign Affairs Commission. The main thrust of the Soviet Union's foreign policy activity has been and remains the struggle to preserve and strengthen universal peace and against the nuclear danger and the arms race. At our 27th party congress, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report and the congress decisions confirmed the defensive orientation of Soviet military doctrine. The Soviet Union develops and maintains its defense potential at the level needed to ensure peace for the peoples of our country and our allies -- no more and no less. He who claims that the Soviet Union is striving for military superiority is speaking an undoubted falsehood: Such an intention is alien to the Soviet Union. The Communist Party, the Soviet Government and our people consider that war cannot and should not be a means of resolving disputes between states. For this reason

there are no motives inciting us either toward military superiority or toward the violation of international agreements. Among the agreements in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament, a special place is held by the Soviet-U.S. accords on preventing nuclear war, on the principles of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and by the first agreement on strategic arms limitation and the second strategic arms limitation agreement, SALT II. Thus, Soviet-U.S. relations in the sphere of strategic arms have been regulated mainly by the ABM treaty, which is without time limit, the provisional SALT I agreement; and the SALT II treaty. The SALT I and SALT II agreements and accords were an important step in reducing the threat of nuclear war and restraining the arms race. Specific measures for a genuine limitation of strategic arms were agreed in them.

In the course of negotiations on SALT I, the sides agreed that there objectively exists a close inter-relation between offensive and defensive strategic arms, and this led to the concentration of effort on, primarily, the preparation of an accord on limiting antimissile defense systems, the ABM Treaty. In essence this treaty became, and remains to the present day, the foundation of the entire strategic arms limitation process. By signing this treaty, the Soviet Union and the United States recognized that in the nuclear age, only mutual restraint in the sphere of antimissile defense systems enables progress to be made along the path of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons.

As far as the SALT II treaty is concerned, it was to have made a major contribution to the further limitation and reduction of strategic offensive weapons, and it put substantial limitations, both quantitatively and qualitatively, on strategic weapons. The limitation was quantitative: the total number of weapons was limited to 2,400, and by 1 January 1981 it was to be reduced to 2,250. And, in addition, there was a limitation on the quality. In other words, the number of multiple-warhead ICBM's was limited to 820; the number of launchers and submarines for multiple-warhead ICBM's was limited to a total of 1,200; and the number of delivery vehicles with multiple warheads and cruise missiles was limited overall to 1,320. What is now being asserted by the American side, and by the U.S. President in particular -- that this treaty made no provision for substantial limitations -- is untruthful. The limitations provided for were extremely substantial, very substantial.

With the coming to power of the Reagan administration in the United States, the SALT I and SALT II accords began to be a hindrance to the nuclear arms race policy and the striving for military superiority which that administration pursues. In addition, the strategic programs of the United States started in 1986 to go beyond the framework of that treaty, and to exceed it. And in order to free his hands to pursue a further nuclear arms race, President Reagan delivered a statement on 27 May 1986 in which he actually spoke of his refusal to continue observing the limitations stipulated in both the SALT II and SALT I agreements. As many years of practical experience have shown, all action under the SALT I and SALT II treaties is reliably monitored.

We do not agree with the U.S. President's statement, and we report to the Foreign Affairs Commissions that the SALT II treaty and the 1972 provisional agreement lend themselves to verification in all their basic provisions. We consider that the statement on the unmonitorability of the SALT II treaty was made in justification of the violations committed by the United States in fulfilling the obligations it has assumed. The Soviet Union has frequently drawn the attention of the U.S. Administration toward its unlawful actions in the sphere of strategic arms, actions which cause us serious concern. As far as the ABM Treaty is concerned, the greatest danger is presented by the program adopted in the United States which is officially named

the Strategic Defense Initiative. It is aimed at creating a large-scale antimissile defense system with, at the same time, the deployment of space-strike weapons to cover the whole United States. Since the principal content of the ABM Treaty is a ban on ABM systems for the defense of the country, the aims of the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative and the ABM Treaty are diametrically opposed. It is clear that every step toward the implementation of the aims of the Strategic Defence Initiative is a step toward destroying the ABM Treaty.

I report to you, comrade-members of the commissions, that our government has entrusted monitoring of the exact observance of the provisional agreement, the SALT II treaty and the ABM Treaty, to the Ministry of Defense and other departments. We very strictly carry out this monitoring of the fulfillment of the accords, and all the provisions of these accords, treaties and agreements are fulfilled in full. The Soviet Union advocates preserving the Soviet-U.S. accords worked out on the basis of the principles of equality and equal security. We are against shattering the ABM treaty, which is of fundamental significance in curbing the race in strategic arms race, both defensive and offensive arms. We consider that even with the status it had before the U.S. President's statement, the SALT II treaty played a positive role in the cause of stabilizing strategic interrelations between the USSR and the United States, and consequently, the international situation as a whole.

However, it is obvious that the Soviet side's attitude toward this treaty cannot be determined without taking account of the U. S. side's actions. For that reason, the Soviet government's statement of 31 May states that as soon as the United States exceeds the established arms level or in any other way violates the other main provisions fixed in the agreement, which have been observed by both sides up until now, the Soviet Union will consider itself free from the corresponding obligations in the 1972 provisional agreement and the SALT II Treaty, and will take the necessary practical measures to prevent military and strategic parity from being undermined.

[Ligachev] Let me give the floor to Comrade Yuli Mikhaylovich Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs.

[Vorontsov] President Reagan's statement of 27 May on the effective renunciation by the United States of further observance on the Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments -- the provisional agreement of 1972 and the 1979 SALT II treaty -- places the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space armaments in a very difficult position. Efforts are currently being made in Geneva -- in full measure by the Soviet delegation -- to move on from the limitations on the nuclear arms race enshrined in the afore-mentioned documents and in the ABM treaty, to substantial reductions of these armaments. And at the same time the United States, through its unilateral actions, is destroying the basis on which this work in Geneva should be conducted. This is equivalent to builders erecting the second floor of a building and then finding that the walls and supports of the first floor are being destroyed beneath them. It must be said that this destructive tendency -- which revealed itself in such unconcealed and overt form in the U.S. President's statement of 27 May -- began long before that date. In signing the SALT II treaty in 1979, the United States took upon itself, together with the Soviet Union, an obligation to effect a reduction of its strategic offensive nuclear arsenals within a 5-year term. But 7 years have elapsed since then, and the SALT II Treaty has failed to be ratified by the United States. Naturally, their non-ratification of the treaty has also made the carrying out of the reductions envisaged in the treaty impossible.

In attempting to justify its present policy -- in which it is banking on the attainment of military superiority, on strong-arm pressure, on the disorganization of the process of limiting the arms race, and on the exacerbation of the situation in the world and of relations with the Soviet Union -- the U.S. Administration is again resorting to a fraudulent propaganda trick; persistent, and one might even say importunate, fabrications vis-a-vis the Soviet Union concerning some kind of contraventions of its assumed obligations. There were no such violations, nor are there now. The Soviet Union proves irrefutably its invariable adherence to international pledges by its actions, by its invariable practice over many years of precisely observing all the obligations it has assumed without any exception.

[Ligachev] Allow me to hand the floor to Comrade Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Energy Commission and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Valikhov] Most esteemed Yegor Kuzmich; most esteemed comrade deputies. The question that is being discussed today really is of enormous importance, particularly in the light of the initiatives the Soviet Union has proposed and which were put forward in the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and of the further steps taken by the Soviet Government. Those initiatives are today supported by millions of people throughout the world.

They are supported by a whole number of governments in a number of countries and by all scientists. A recent conference in Moscow attended by Soviet scientists and a number of scientists invited from virtually all regions showed that the overwhelming majority of scientists support those initiatives and realize that the way out for mankind historically, and the path to survival and an actual future for mankind, lies precisely in getting rid of nuclear weapons and creating a system of equal security, the system that we have been speaking of, the system of which we have said that we have no interest in greater security for ourselves than for anyone else, the system that is determined by the realities of the nuclear age.

Of enormous importance today in this regard are the historic Soviet initiatives, the unilateral action of good will which the Soviet Union has taken in abandoning nuclear weapons tests for a long period, not testing weapons systems or putting them into space. This action is also of enormous importance for the mobilization of all forces on the planet to solve these most important tasks. And, in this context, we have also discussed questions connected with the treaties that were signed during the seventies between the Soviet Union and the United States. We have discussed these questions in the Defense Ministry, the Foreign Ministry and a number of ministries and departments with the chiefs, scientists, military men and politicians. Primarily we came to the conclusion, or rather we yet again confirmed the view, that the treaties which were signed and which have already been enumerated here -- I don't think they need to be enumerated again, but primarily they are the 1972 treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems and a number of other treaties, such as the agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, the treaty on not putting mass annihilation weapons into space, and a number of other treaties -- really do play a very important role, and have played an important role, despite all the limitations inherent in them, which have already been mentioned.

In this regard, we were indeed particularly disturbed by the issue of the policy to which the U.S. Administration is currently adhering, a policy geared to undermining, discrediting, and destroying this whole system of treaties. We can see that this policy also derives from an attempt -- in the circumstances of the nuclear age, in the circumstances of the historically-achieved strategic balance between the Soviet Union and the United States -- to get out of this situation, to find some sort of exit based on the creation of strategic superiority, and at the same time, of course, from the pressure of the military-industrial complex, which Yegor Kuzmich mentioned.

In its search for such a way out, the United States is destroying this whole system of treaties, and is, above all, acting to discredit these treaties. The attempt to discredit them is taking place mainly by means of undermining and violating these treaties. It must be said, moreover, that the United States is violating the treaties: When we considered the violations, already referred to here, we singled out above all the most fundamental violations of the treaties on the part of the United States. The most fundamental violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty is indeed the development [razvorachivaniye] of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative program. This program -- to use the language of the legal code -- is aimed at, so to speak, the purposeful undermining of the agreements and treaties which have been concluded. When it is said, in effect, that things could be arranged in such a way that troops could be brought up to the border, and all that remains is for the border to be crossed, and after that to say: We don't need the treaty -- this is the most cynical and fundamental violation of the very spirit of the treaty.

The same situation obtains with the treaty, or rather the provisional agreement of 1972 and the 1979 treaty on strategic defensive [corrects himself] ... strategic offensive armaments. The policy being pursued by the U.S. Administration -- a policy aimed at the undermining and liquidation of the treaties -- today finds itself truly at odds not just with the Soviet Union's interests, but also the interests of all peace-loving forces. For this reason, we believe that the Soviet Union's firm stance, backed up by the struggle of all peace-loving forces both in the world at the large and in the United States -- such forces exist in the United States -- this policy has a strong chance of halting developments aimed at the deterioration of the international situation and of pointing the development of the international situation toward the correct resolution of all matters and the improvement of the international situation.

[Ligachev] Permit me, comrades, to hand the floor to Comrade Natalya Vladimirovna Orlova, member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union and a weaver at the Moscow Trekhgorka combine.

[Orlova] Comrade deputies. After attentively listening to speeches by the representatives of the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on how the Soviet Union is carrying out its commitments that were undertaken under the treaties on the limitation of strategic armaments, and after familiarizing myself with the documents of the group of deputies who carried out a corresponding check in these ministries, I contend that we can state with every assurance that these commitments are being strictly observed. However, as far as the other side -- the United States -- is concerned, we are right to express grave apprehensions over how things stand in this regard with that country, the more so now, when the whole world has heard the statements by Washington's leaders to the effect that they have decided to give up the agreements on limiting nuclear armaments. Now everyone can see why these gentlemen needed their truly unseemly, unsubstantiated and deeply offensive accusations against the Soviet Union alleging that we have been violating these agreements.

As an ordinary worker, a weaver by vocation, I find it difficult to understand how such high-ranking people, who have control of a major power, can resort to such techniques in attempts to justify a policy for which there can be no justification. It is not for nothing that people say that lies will not get you far, and the truth will soon be revealed. Indeed, the truth was revealed when the U.S. President himself, on 27 May, announced that he had decided to give up implementing the SALT II treaty, which he permitted himself to call defective. This is being said about a very important document, which took 7 long years to draw up under three presidents -- the present President's predecessors. Moreover, not only the political leaders of the United States, but its military leaders, too, stated at the time it was being signed that it accorded with U.S. national interests.

I am not a professional politician. I am very fond of my work speciality. Work in the highest body of the people's power is an honorary and very responsible civil duty that has been entrusted to me by my voters -- working people like myself. I probably lack sufficient political experience at the times, but I understand clearly, as do millions of ordinary people around the globe, what catastrophic consequences for the fate of mankind could arise from a precipitate step by the U.S. Administration. The peaceful foreign policy course that was adopted by the 27th congress of our party, and the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet state that are being put forward in accordance with the decisions of the congress, are an expression of the will for peace of all Soviet people.

I state this with every responsibility on behalf of my work comrades and my voters, as a candidate nominated for the highest organ of Soviet power by a collective of workers, and elected by the working people of the Krasnaya Presnya Rayon in Moscow.

But our patience is not limitless, and we fully support the statement by the Soviet Government that it will not stand by and see the United States smash the agreement that was achieved earlier, and also that the U.S. side should not have any illusions about succeeding in achieving military advantages for itself at the expense of the security of others.

Comrade deputies, we are living and working at an intense, difficult, but interesting and crucial time. Our people are to work on solving the grand-scale tasks of socialist construction that were outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress. It is in the solution of those tasks that our peaceful and happy future lies, the future of our children. It is a joyous thing to know that this future lies in our hands, in our labor, and we will allow no one to encroach upon it.

[Ligachev] Allow me to hand the floor to Comrade Anatoliy Fedorovich Dobrynin, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the USSR Soviet of Nationalities and secretary of the party Central Committee.

[Dobrynin] Esteemed comrade deputies. Permit me briefly to sum up a few results of the discussion that has taken place. First, it confirmed that the commissions have engaged in a study of this problem with every justification and in good time. The very logic of today's developments and the realities of the nuclear age place at the center of world politics the question of the need for restraint in the relations between the two major powers, which possess the enormous potential of weapons of mass annihilation, and of the vital need to limit their stockpiling and then to liquidate them. This approach by our party and the Soviet state was confirmed yet again at the June Central Committee Plenum and the just-ended USSR Supreme Soviet session. It is a matter, as you know, of the

necessity of preventing a deepening of the military-political confrontation that imperialist reaction wants to foist upon mankind. If it is not prevented, the world will be threatened with sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe. The course of the Soviet government is aimed precisely at preventing such a development. It was in this broad context that our commissions arrived at their assessment of the actions by the U.S. administration.

Second, it was noted that in the West, too — and not only among public opinion, but also among statesmen, parliamentarians and politicians — there is a growing understanding on the stance adopted and the practical action that will be taken by the United States on the question of observing the agreements which it signed with the Soviet Union, that not only the future of Soviet-U.S. relations, but also East-West relations as a whole depend in no small degree.

In the 3 weeks which have elapsed since the White House officially announced its unwillingness to take account of the limitations stipulated in the SALT II treaty, many people in the United States and the NATO countries have gained a clearer awareness of how disastrous and futureless is the path down which the U.S. administration is pushing its allies and partners, and how dangerous are its thoughtless actions for the destiny of universal peace. Western Europe is essentially distancing itself from Washington's decisions; in the United States itself, demands for these to be reviewed are heard increasingly loudly. It is very typical in this regard that the Foreign Affairs Commission of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives has adopted a resolution, by a large majority of votes, calling on the administration and President Reagan not to exceed the basis mutually agreed with the USSR or quantitative limitations under the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty.

Third, the Foreign Affairs Commissions came to the firm conclusion: The Soviet Union is observing the treaty obligations it has assumed. The groundlessness of the U.S. grievances against us in this connection have been convincingly demonstrated in the speeches by representatives of the USSR Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other comrades whom we have heard today. Our discussion should undoubtedly assist world public opinion better to understand the essence of the matter.

Fourth, the discussion at our commissions' session demonstrated the true motives and reasons behind the U.S. Administration's dangerous step. A political evaluation of this was given in the Soviet Government statement of 31 May. Today's examination of this issue has reconfirmed that the SALT treaties do not suit the most bellicose circles in the United States, since these agreements are based upon the principle of parity and equal security, stipulate strategic parity, and are an obstacle to the U.S. realization of its wide-scale military preparations. And when the framework of the treaty limitations became too narrow for these preparations and programs, the United States quite simply decided to cast the agreements aside. This, comrades, is a bankrupt and dangerous path.

The results of our deliberations thus confirm that an exceptionally alarming situation is now developing in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction. The negative consequences of the U.S. Administration's decision to renounce the agreements concluded in the sphere of limitation of strategic offensive weapons are already making themselves felt. The state of affairs at the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space weapons has clearly become more difficult, where discussion of the issue of reduction of strategic offensive weapons will now be conducted in circumstances in which the U.S. rejects any limitations upon it.

The serious doubts over whether this administration wants fresh accords, which we already and before, have now received substantial confirmation. It is now obvious the U.S. administration wants no headway. Evidently, there are different reasons here. But they have a common denominator -- a fear of disarmament, a fear of detente -- and as a result we have an aggravation of international tension. Our position is clear, comrades. As was stressed both at the Central Committee plenum and the USSR Supreme Soviet session, the Soviet Union will continue persistently countering the dangerous course of the United States with our consistent line toward shaping international relations which are appropriate for the nuclear space age, and thus with initiative and persistence seeking an exit from the impasse into which the U.S. extremist circles are striving to push the world. You do not need to go far to find examples.

As is known, at the Soviet-U.S. talks a few days ago, the Soviet Union made fresh proposals capable of helping find a mutually-acceptable compromise and of clearing the way for an accord on the substantial reduction of nuclear armaments. Of no lesser importance are the new initiatives of the allied socialist countries, which have come forward with a program for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

One cannot but agree with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's words: If the U.S. side again ignores the Soviet initiative, it will be obvious that the U.S. Administration is playing an unworthy game in a most serious matter, a matter on which the future of mankind depends.

Comrade deputies, in the current situation, it is thus exceedingly important that the U.S. Government should once again weigh up all the responsibility it is taking upon itself in making a decision leading to the collapse of the SALT process, and that it should draw the appropriate conclusions while there is still time.

Summing up our discussion, it can be firmly stated that the USSR Supreme Soviet and its deputies are fully determined to do everything for their part to halt the process of the destruction of the previously created basis for the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments, to prevent the world from sliding toward nuclear chaos, and to seek mutually-acceptable accords deriving from the demands and realities of the nuclear age.
[end recording]

The Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution on the situation concerning the Soviet-U.S. agreements on the limitation of strategic armaments resulting from the actions of the U.S. Government.

IZVESTIYA Commentary

PM231547 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua article: "Parliamentarians' Duty"]

[Text] The hot June sun pierces the tightly closed blinds and sparkles on the crystal lampshade. Behind a long rectangular table are people whom the supreme organ of power, the USSR Supreme Soviet, has entrusted with the problems of our state's foreign policy -- the members of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commissions. There is just one question on the agenda -- the status of Soviet-U.S. strategic arms limitation agreements as a result of the actions of the U.S. Government.

There is only one question on the agenda... But that question surpasses all others. A great deal depends on its resolution -- whether there will be peace or war on the planet, cooperation for the sake of all peoples, or an unchecked arms race. That is why the conventional formula "agenda" is filled with special content. It is a question not just of the present day but, and this is the main thing, the future -- to ensure that the future happens, a future without wars or weapons.

Today IZVESTIYA publishes a detailed report on the commissions' joint session. Therefore I will not go in for repetition. The following are merely the brief observations and impressions of someone who followed the course of the session from the press galleries.

Literally a few hours before the session started U.S. President Reagan spoke in the American town of Glassboro, New Jersey, to local secondary school graduates. He tried, incidentally, to persuade his young countrymen that "people in the Soviet Union have virtually no influence on their government." What a pity these young men and women could not have attended the Kremlin sessions and heard the people's voice and the topics it dealt with. Incidentally, one of the speakers in the debates cited a letter from the Soviet peasant Andropova -- I did not catch her first name -- to the U.S. President. In this letter she recalled Reagan's speech on Soviet television. How much time has passed since then, she wrote, but not one word of yours about "giving people a breath of fresh air" has been implemented.

Yes, Washington is now up to something quite different. The coincidence is symbolic that on the very day when the President was speaking in Glassboro a letter in his name was handed to congressional leaders "justifying" a further arms race and the "need" to break any shackles preventing it.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commissions also made an appeal to Congress. I am referring to the resolution adopted at their 20 June joint session. Read its text.

It is as different from the President's message to Congress as chalk is from cheese. The dreams are different and the aims are different -- the dreams are about peace and the aim is to preserve it. There are entirely realistic grounds for hoping that the Soviet parliamentarians' voice will be heard on Capitol Hill. It is without reason that the White House's virtual denunciation of the SALT I interim agreement and the SALT II treaty triggered opposition in Congress. On 20 June -- yet another symbolic coincidence! -- the House of Representatives voted by 256 to 145 to adopt a resolution calling on the Reagan administration to observe SALT II. On the same day even the Senate Armed Services Committee, which is controlled by representatives of the ruling Republican Party, voted by 10 to 9 to adopt a similar resolution submitted by Senator Hart.

The congressmen are not concerned without reason. "Abandoning SALT II in order to strengthen U.S. security is the same as getting rid of the criminal code in hopes of cutting the crime rate," Senator Bumpers noted graphically. But does the Reagan administration want reductions in the arms race? That is the question, and it too is sternly and implacably on the agenda. The resolution adopted by the House of Representatives reflects the mood of the American public, which is profoundly concerned at the course of an administration that is derailing highly important accords in the strategic arms limitation and reduction sphere and eliminating the obstacles in the way of a nuclear missile race. But, unfortunately, the House resolution is not binding on the government and places it under no obligation other than a moral one. And morality, as is well known, is now in very short supply on the banks of the Potomac.

Here is yet another lesson in point for the Glassboro schoolchildren. The resolutions of the organs of the Soviet Union's supreme power are binding on its government, and the government itself scrupulously carries out the commitments it has undertaken, including those under international treaties. For both our power and government are of the people, and their supreme duty, to paraphrase the simple Soviet peasant's words to President Reagan, are to give people "breath of the fresh air of freedom and peace.

...The hot June sun pierces the tightly closed blinds and sparkles on the crystal lamp-shade. Outside the window lies an entire planet -- unique, beautiful, and fragile.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: NATO HALIFAX MEETING DISCUSSES U.S. SALT II STANCE

U.S. Stance Causes 'Alarm'

LD311839 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 30 May 86

[Yuriy Soltan commentary]

[Text] For the NATO council completing its session in Halifax, Canada, our commentator Yuriy Soltan makes these observations:

The United States is using this conference of NATO foreign ministers as a sort of cover for a policy of its own, a policy that has dashed the hopes of many, including America's allies for an early agreement in the field of disarmament. Just consider American actions in recent times. When the Soviet Union extended its unilateral nuclear moratorium for the third time running, the United States replied by carrying out yet another nuclear test in Nevada and announcing preparations for more. While the Soviet Union advanced proposals making for an early conclusion of an international agreement to fully ban chemical weapons and destroy all of their arsenals, the United States was pushing through NATO its decision to produce and deploy in Europe chemical arms of a new type, the binary ones. At the Geneva talks the Soviet delegation offered a concrete plan for basic reductions in the nuclear arsenals. This country also proposed radical cuts in the conventional arms and troops in Europe. The Reagan administration has ignored these proposals, and what is more it has announced its intention to abandon this fall the treaty on limiting strategic offensive weapons, SALT II, which Washington had promised to observe without ratification.

Such American moves have generated concern and alarm even in the NATO countries. Six of them have rejected plans for the deployment of binary weapons on their territory. Protests against Washington's intentions to scrap the SALT II treaty have just been heard at this session of the NATO council. But America is bent on conducting its line; with total disregard for the opinions of its allies it continues to pressure and draw them even deeper into the orbit of a runaway arms race.

'Irritation' With U.S. Noted

LD302153 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 30 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The NATO foreign ministers meeting is continuing in the Canadian city of Halifax. With it this meeting the routine round of meetings of leading officials of the Atlantic bloc nears completion.

Earlier, the defense ministers and the high-ranking military officials of the NATO countries held consultations in Brussels. U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger imposed on his bloc partners there a program for the production and deployment in Western Europe of a new form of chemical weapon -- binary weapons.

In Halifax, the head of the Pentagon has been replaced by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, but his task remains much the same: He has continued to exert pressure on the allies, demanding unquestioned adherence to the U.S. line. But this time, the United States has met with open dissatisfaction.

Many West European countries are outraged by Washington's lack of desire to take their interests into account. This was shown recently, in particular at a conference on contacts between people which has just ended in Berne. There, at the last moment, the U.S. delegation vetoed the summary document agreed by all the participants in the meeting, including Western countries.

The West German Newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, commenting on this step wrote: The irritation is truly universal. The decision by the United States in isolation without taking the interests of even its allies into account, characterizes the new style of Washington in dealing with its friends. Earlier, this style was tried out by way of the bombing of Libya and also in the trade relations between Washington and the Europeans.

Allies Oppose U.S. SALT II Stance

LD302158 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 30 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] At the present time, the dissatisfaction of the Western allies has been aroused by the intention of the White House to refuse to observe the Soviet-American SALT II agreement.

U.S. President Reagan has pointed out that the United States intends to violate the treaty at the end of this year, when it will equip its B-52 bombers with cruise missiles and thus exceed the relevant limit set by the agreement.

Even before the start of the session in Halifax, the NATO allies warned Washington that they were against a rejection of the treaty, that they considered it most dangerous to reject one of the few effective agreements in the sphere of arms control. They tried to get the U.S. Administration to change its mind at the session itself. Canadian Foreign Minister Clark stated that the attitude of the United States to SALT II causes great concern. He was echoed by the other ministers of NATO countries.

Nevertheless, the Washington administration refused to listen to their voices. If, formerly, certain observers had doubts regarding the true intentions of the White House--there were suppositions that the statements by Reagan were merely a maneuver called upon to calm right-wing circles in the United States--now the position of Washington has been revealed.

Secretary of State Shultz clearly said that for the United States, SALT II is already dead. You cannot say it more clearly than that, as they say. The speech by Shultz caused confusion among those participating in the session. Attempting somehow to smooth over the impression of the shameless statements by Washington. British Foreign Secretary Howe called for serious talks with the Soviet Union. He stated passionately that the West needs fresh and bold ideas in order to prove that precisely the West and not the Soviet Union seeks progress on the path of disarmament.

But these are just words. We should only welcome attempts by the United States and other NATO countries to demonstrate their desire to put an end to the arms race, or at least to limit them. However, the U.S. Administration has so far not made even a symbolic step in this direction. How can one speak of the search for new agreements to control arms if the American side does not want to recognize one that has already been signed.

Understanding this, the leaders of a number of Western countries have continued their attempts to get the Washington administration to change its mind.

U.S. Seeks 'Supremacy'

LD302236 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] At the session of the NATO Council in Halifax, Canada, many have voiced disagreement and concern over the United States Administration intending to exceed the limits set on strategic nuclear armaments by the SALT II treaty. Commentary has been prepared by Gennadiy Shishkin, and this is what he writes.

So the United States has decided to mount cruise missiles later in the year on more B-52 bombers than SALT II permits. This virtually means that America is withdrawing from this treaty and that nuclear arms control will get a blow. The Reagan administration is again confirming it rejects the SALT II principle of equality and equal security, it's trying to secure arms supremacy at any cost and continue the arms race on earth and move it to space. Over the 6 years of the present administration in office, nothing has been achieved in arms reduction, but much has been destroyed.

Even the close allies of the administration in Washington can't agree with its attitude to nuclear arms. At NATO's session in Halifax the representatives of Britain, Federal Germany, France, and many other countries said they very much regretted the administration's decision. Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney predicted the decision will not be endorsed by NATO, and certainly not by the Canadian Government. But judging by what United States Secretary of State George Shultz remarked, officials in Washington intend to ignore the discontent of its allies, and they are going to ignore the opinion of the American people too.

Opinion polls have showed that more than 75 percent of the Americans favor a tougher arms control. To abide by SALT II was what the United States President was asked last April by 52 senators and 220 house representatives, or most Congressmen, but the request has been ignored. At a news conference in Washington last Thursday, former United States Defense Secretary Robert McNamara noted the presidential decision to violate the key SALT II provisions would lead to an unrestrained nuclear arms race. A race of this kind seems to be what the White House wants, neglecting possible consequences for international security.

The Soviet Union recently gave another reminder that the United States Administration would assume a heavy responsibility if it inflates the strategic nuclear arms limits of SALT II. Officials in Moscow said the Soviet Union will draw proper conclusions and take steps to safeguard its security and that of its allies. He said it will not permit an upsetting of the balance established under the treaty.

'Frank Dissatisfaction' Seen

LD310149 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1915 GMT 30 May 86

[Report from "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The session of foreign ministers of the NATO member-countries is coming to an end in the Canadian city of Halifax. Before its opening, observers wrote that the United States would be trying to rally the NATO ranks, having called its partners to Atlantic solidarity, that it would make an attempt to get its allies to join even more closely in its campaign to combat so-called international terrorism.

However, the reports from Halifax show that the contradictions have become acute in NATO's ranks. Washington's junior partners are displaying a frank dissatisfaction with the unwillingness of the U.S. Administration to take their interests into account. The most serious differences were caused by the White House's decision to refuse to abide by the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II agreement.

The U.S. allies are deeply concerned at this kind of step. They have pointed out the danger of Washington's decision for the future of relations between East and West. They stressed that it would lead to an escalation in the arms race.

Genscher, FRG minister of foreign affairs, noted that Reagan's statement on renunciation of the treaty must not be the last word of the United States. Even the representative of Britain's Conservative government, Howe, spoke of London's extreme regret regarding the U.S. actions. Opposition to the White House decision has even increased in the United States itself. Former U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara stated that without the SALT treaty, the entire structure of arms control agreements that was created over a period of 15 to 20 years by four U.S. presidents will be destroyed.

Concluding Document Criticized

LD311409 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1225 GMT 31 May 86

[Excerpt] Halifax/Nova Scotia Province, 31 May (TASS) -- The 2-day session of the NATO Council at foreign minister level has ended its work here. It has once again demonstrated the lack of desire and the inability of the North Atlantic alliance to reply in a reasonable and businesslike way to the constructive, far-reaching initiatives of the USSR, and of the Warsaw Pact countries. It has confirmed the lack of understanding of the leaders of the Western alliance and above all of the United States, of the necessity for new thinking that is demanded by all humanity by the dimensions of the nuclear-missile threat hanging over the planet.

The concluding document of the session, sparkling with references to the myth inflated by Western propaganda about the notorious "Soviet military threat" once again affirms NATO's intention to continue along the path of further whipping up military and political tension in Europe. "We shall retain the strategy of deterrence pursued by the alliance," the statement says. Against this background, the discourses about the "resolve" of NATO to "continue the efforts in the interest of progress in the sphere of arms control and disarmament," sound extremely unconvincing.

Having thoroughly ignored the recent peaceful initiatives of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries, the participants of the session in Halifax are merely promoting their own "initiatives" that are blatantly aimed at securing unilateral advantages. The assertion that NATO countries are "striving to achieve the conclusion of a treaty that completely eliminates chemical weapons" sounds, in this context, like a blatant insult to common sense. Indeed, the decision taken within NATO in favor of binary weapons should create a program for years ahead not only for the retention but also for the intensification of the chemical threat to humanity.

The so-called "Halifax Declaration" devoted to the control of conventional weapons also contains nothing besides words.

At the same time, as is clear from the public statements of the participants of the session and press reports, the concluding documents of the session that were adopted under pressure from the United States were called upon to smooth over the sharp differences of opinion in which atmosphere it took place. "The meeting in Halifax has created new cracks and tension in relations amongst the NATO allies," the CBC television company stated, recalling that the NATO member countries are "acting against the threat of President Reagan to get rid of SALT II." It was precisely this question that caused the main arguments between the United States -- which found itself in complete isolation at the session as a result of the decision by President Reagan to violate SALT II in the near future -- and the representatives of the other NATO member countries. In the words of the AP news agency, "not one of the 15 NATO partners of the United States supported Reagan's opinion that SALT II should be buried at the end of the year."

Explaining the stance of the West European countries, THE WASHINGTON POST notes: "The allies are apprehensive that if the United States was to reject the policy of voluntary observation of the treaty, European confidence in the United States would be undermined and strong antinuclear feelings would resurface in the NATO countries."

The United States, however, openly ignored the appeals from its allies for continued observance of SALT II. Speaking at a press conference on the conclusion of the NATO Council session, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz stated that henceforth when deciding on issues about what weapons are needed to guarantee national security, Washington will proceed from military considerations and not from the "formalities" of SALT II.

USSR Initiatives 'Ignored'

LD312154 Moscow TASS in English 2127 GMT 31 May 86

[Text] Halifax (Canada) May 31 TASS -- The two-day session of the NATO Council at the level of foreign ministers which closed here demonstrated anew the unwillingness and inability of the North Atlantic alliance to respond sensibly and in a businesslike manner to the constructive and far-reaching initiatives of the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty countries. It reaffirmed that the leaders of the Western alliance, primarily the USA, do not understand the need for new thinking, demanded from mankind by the dimensions of the nuclear-missile threat looming over the world.

The final document of the session, bristling with allegations about the "Soviet military threat," whipped up by Western propaganda, reaffirms NATO's intention to continue to escalate military and political tension in Europe. The statement stresses that the alliance will continue to pursue its strategy of deterrence. Talk about NATO's "resolve" to continue efforts for progress towards arms control and disarmament that has been included in the document sounds very unconvincing against this background.

The participants in the Halifax session totally ignored the recent peace proposals of the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty countries but are touting their own "initiatives," designed to secure unilateral advantage for the West. The claim that the NATO countries are seeking a treaty completely to abolish chemical weapons is sounding as open travesty of common sense. In reality the decisions taken by the alliance on the production of binary weapons are actually programming for years ahead the continuation and, moreover, escalation of the chemical threat to mankind as a whole.

The "Halifax declaration" on conventional arms control contains nothing except general rhetoric.

At the same time, as public statements by participants in the session and press reports indicate, the final documents of the session, approved under U.S. pressure, are intended to smooth over the acute differences which were plaguing it. The USA found itself in isolation at the session because of President Reagan's decision to violate the SALT-2 treaty in the near future. According to the AP, none of the U.S. 15 NATO partners supported Reagan's view that the SALT-2 treaty should be buried by the end of the year.

'Cracks' in NATO Solidarity

PM050958 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladimir Shelkov Commentator's Column: "Glib Documents"]

[Text] The spring session of the NATO foreign ministers council has been held in the Canadian city of Halifax. The foreign policy department leaders of the 16 member-countries of this aggressive alliance held a 2-day discussion behind closed doors, this time not governed by a prearranged agenda.

NATO's bosses, above all the United States, tried to make the question of "consolidating forces in the face of international terrorism" a matter of paramount importance at the present session. However, the ministers' attention centered on completely different problems during the discussion in Halifax. These problems were connected with the whole range of East-West relations and, above all, the continuing arms race. As the briefings held by delegation spokesmen noted, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz had to hear quite a few anxious words during the session, particularly about the U.S. plans to begin production of binary weapons. But the most serious differences between Washington and its partners appeared on the White House's intentions to finally abandon the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty. The NATO partners' concern at the consequences of such a move by the United States proved much stronger than the leadership's desire not to air their differences in public and not to publicize the conflicts that had emerged.

For example, Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney stated that these U.S. intentions "will not be supported by NATO and will undoubtedly not be approved by the Canadian Government."

The foreign ministers of Britain, the FRG, the Netherlands, and other bloc member-countries also expressed concern at the fate of the SALT II treaty in view of the White House's recent actions.

Nevertheless, under U.S. pressure, the session's main statement bypassed the most acute points of conflict. On the whole the final documents reflected the NATO leadership's concern at the tremendous appeal of the Soviet Union's constructive stance on problems of ending the arms race -- in both nuclear and conventional arms. Attempting to find a propaganda counter to the USSR's realistic proposals, the authors of those documents yet again resorted to citing the "Soviet military threat."

The Halifax sessions of NATO's supreme organ again demonstrated this military alliance's inability to respond in a businesslike manner to the sensible initiatives of the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies. At the same time the present NATO council session also provides evidence of the deep cracks within "Atlantic solidarity" which can hardly be papered over by glib final documents.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BACKS SALT II COMPLIANCE

Foreign Affairs Committee

LD132211 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 13 Jun 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The renunciation by the Reagan administration of one of the most important Soviet-American agreements in the arms control sphere, SALT II, has led to sharp criticism from U.S. politicians, the public and the press. The House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee has voted 29 votes to 11 for the adoption of a resolution calling on the administration to observe the quantitative limits set by SALT II for as long as the Soviet Union does the same. A number of members of the house declared that a renunciation of SALT II will merely spur the arms race and jeopardize the prospects of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments. The White House, however, does not want to reckon with the fully justified alarm of legislators and the broadest circles of the public. Speakes, White House assistant press secretary, declared cynically that SALT II no longer exists, it is dead.

Full House

LD200832 Moscow TASS in English 0749 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 20 Jun (TASS)--The U.S. Congress House of Representatives adopted by a majority vote (256 for, 145 against) a resolution demanding that the administration observe the SALT II Treaty. The decision by the White House to stop observing the treaty in the near future, said House of Representatives Speaker Thomas O'Neill, is a tragic blunder. The House of Representatives and the Senate are also debating bills forbidding appropriations of funds to produce weapons which are outside the limits set by the SALT II Treaty.

House, Senate Bills

LD201543 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 20 TASS-- The House of Representatives of U.S. Congress approved by 256 votes against 145 a resolution urging the Reagan administration to respect the SALT-2 treaty. On the same day the Republican-controlled Senate Armed Services Committee approved by 10 votes against nine a similar resolution proposed by Senator Gary Hart. The House and the Senate now have before them bills sponsored by large groups of lawmakers to block congressional appropriations on the production of armaments which go beyond the bounds of the SALT-2 treaty.

The Administration is up in arms against congressional action. Deputy White House Press Secretary Larry Speakes said at a regular briefing in his comments on the House resolution that the administration did not consider it binding. Trying to dampen the criticism of the White House position on compliance with the Soviet-American accords that is growing all over the country and in Congress, the administration has launched a massive propaganda campaign in a bid to justify its position. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle are trying especially hard. They resort to McCarthyist methods, actually labelling arms control supporters as "instigators of the subversion of U.S. security" and "reds' helpmates."

The Senate Democratic Minority Leader Robert Byrd, who crossed swords with the Pentagon "hawks," said that it was important not to spoil the atmosphere in Geneva or to do anything that would dim the chance of any accord at a summit meeting. The White House decision, House Speaker Thomas O'Neill said, is a tragic mistake, while Congressman Richard Gephardt stressed that in this way the administration was actually removing all the barriers to the arms race.

Zholkver Comments

LD201803 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Commentary by station Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress has adopted a resolution calling on the President to observe the provisions of the Soviet-American agreement on limiting strategic weapons. Here is our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver with a "latest news" commentary:

The Congress' decision is remarkable in many respects. Above all, it reflects the constant significance of the SALT II agreement, even though I would remind you that, after being signed in June 1979, it was not ratified by the United States, and, formally, its period of validity expired at the end of last year.

The whole point is the agreement remains a living effective document that embodies the positive results of the two powers' cooperation during the seventies in the cause of restraining the arms race. Moreover, as long as both sides adhere to it, of course, the agreement creates more favorable conditions for drawing up new understandings on limiting and reducing armaments. You know that our country, making use, in particular, of the opportunities provided by the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, has, on more than one occasion, tabled constructive proposals on the subject, including new measures and approaches as set out in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report to the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Something else must also be said: The very same forces that did not permit ratification of the agreement -- I mean the U.S. military-industrial complex -- have made all kinds of attempts to get out of it, and even recently declared it dead. However, this reasoning, if one may so call it, did not find support among American parliamentarians. Senator Bumpers -- a resolution in support of SALT II is also being considered in the Senate -- shrewdly observed that renouncing the agreement in order to strengthen the security of the United States is just like getting rid of the criminal code in hopes of reducing crime.

I would make the point that such pronouncements can be heard these days coming from American parliamentarians of both parties -- both Democrats and Republicans.

The resolution was also passed in the House of Representatives by a majority 256 votes from both parties against 145.

Of course, one should have no illusions about such a resolution. There have already been five of them in the Congress, and they have, unfortunately, had no particular effect. This time, too, some administration spokesmen have stated that congressional resolutions have no binding force, and the Pentagon chief even demands that they be declared unconstitutional.

Nevertheless, a fact remains a fact. American parliamentarians no longer risk ignoring world opinion, including that of the American public. That prompts the administration not to slam the door on the new peace initiatives of the USSR.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: ALLIES' REACTION TO REAGAN SALT II DECISION ASSESSED

DER STERN Cited

LD062116 Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 6 Jun (TASS)--President Reagan's decision to end compliance with SALT II opened the floodgate holding back the arms race and destroyed the foundation of the policy of coexistence built in the 1970's, the STERN magazine wrote in a commentary.

President Reagan's move, the magazine went on, so far seems the highest, but undoubtedly not the last, apogee of the American policy which scares the allies more and more. Never before since World War II has the rift between America and Europe been so great, and this alienation is growing with each passing day.

There isn't a single major issue on which Washington and Europe are unanimous—from space arms into which NATO partners were drawn against their will, to air attacks on Libya, the U.S. announcement about a start in the production of toxic agents, and the cardinal problem of East-West relations, the commentary said.

Last week the U.S. torpedoed with its veto, after all, the joint statement of the countries participating in the Helsinki process. The outcome of the voting was 1-34, in other words, America against the rest of the world. Europe, as Felipe Gonzalez, the Spanish prime minister, put it rather mildly some time ago, has become the "parliamentary opposition inside NATO."

The reality is even worse from allies Europeans turned into subordinates. Even less interest is shown in their views than in the opinion of a senator from an out-of-the-way state.

During the Halifax session the foreign ministers of NATO countries took note with impotent indignation, of President Reagan's decision to end the compliance with SALT II. Washington did not even consider its necessary to consult its allies on that fundamental issue of the joint policy, the magazine emphasized.

Reagan's policy is the reunification not only of the idea of disarmament, but also of the principle of co-existence and superpower equilibrium. It stabs the alliance in the very heart because it contradicts the fundamental, vital interests of Europe--the need for security and peace.

However, when the interests of the partners differ so greatly and the protecting nation no longer guarantees security, but instead begins to cause fear, the question arises whether there is sense in the alliance at all, STERN wrote in conclusion.

Canadian Arms Control Center

LD062147 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Nikolay Borin commentary]

[Text] The Canadian Center for Arms Control has described as totally groundless Washington's claims that the Soviet Union has violated the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT II. It said so in a special statement issued in Ottawa. We now bring you a commentary by Nikolay Borin, and this is what he writes:

This is the third influential military information center to confirm directly or indirectly that there is strategic parity between the United States and the Soviet Union, and to refute attempts to blame Moscow for violations of SALT II. The Center for Defense Information in Washington and the Institute of Strategic Studies based in London share that opinion of their Canadian counterpart. Experts at the London institute have stressed the fact that the strategic balance between the two blocs had inclined in the West's favor in 1985. However, President Reagan this week has put heavy pressure on Congress to make it approve a huge, \$320 billion military budget. President Reagan in his message to Congress said that any money taken from the United States strategic programs would mark a victory for potential aggressors.

Mr Reagan has obviously resorted to the old formula of John Dulles, one of the masterminds of the cold war, who was American secretary of state in the fifties. Mr Dulles said that to make the country carry a heavy burden of arms spending it was necessary to create the impression that there's a foreign threat to produce an atmosphere similar to that of wartime.

Intensive efforts to push the military budget through Congress have coincided with a White House announcement that it is going to make inroads into SALT II. This is not accidental because it is the Soviet-American strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT II, and the antiballistic missile treaty that have prevented an unrestricted race in strategic arms. After making inroads into the SALT II treaty the United States Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, made it clear that Washington was not going to strictly comply with the ABM treaty, if that agreement were an obstacle in the way of the star wars program.

Naturally, Western Europe cannot but be concerned that the United States has turned a deaf ear to calls from its NATO allies for honoring arms control agreements. The interests of American munitions corporations which fear that the production of missiles and nuclear warheads may start declining have been put before the interests of the political alliance. The United States military-industrial corporations have for nearly 30 years lived on arming ground, naval and air nuclear forces. The West German magazine DER SPIEGEL says American firms fear that in four years the fame of their names would dwindle and their estates grow scanty. This is the reason, the West German magazine says, why the containment doctrine which is still proclaimed as a NATO doctrine cannot guarantee a prolonged growth for United States military-industrial companies. The White House, while giving its munitions monopolies a free hand, had decided to lay mines under a common policy of NATO countries and under bilateral agreements with Moscow. In other words, down with any obstacles in the way of superprofits for military-industrial firms. This is Washington's slogan today, and it is dangerous. The Canadian Center for Arms Control says that policy is going to smash the delicate and vital structure of arms control which has been created over the past 15 years.

U.S.-Europe 'Split'

LD092146 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Commentary by TASS political observer Aleksey Grigoriyev]

[Excerpts] The West German newspaper WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE has said that NATO did have periods of uncertainty in the past, however, few were the occasions when signs of a split were seen so clearly as after President Reagan's announcement that the United States virtually abandoned the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty SALT II. Indeed Washington's allies are obviously anxious about its arbitrary actions on the international scene. In London THE TIMES says Canada told a NATO council session in Halifax that it was profoundly concerned about President Reagan's decision. Federal Germany described it as fraught with disaster for the arms control process.

The British Prime Minister Mrs Thatcher, during debates in the House of commons on 3 June, repeatedly said it was important that both sides comply with the SALT II Treaty. If Mrs Thatcher had avoided saying that she would have cut the ground from under the feet of her Cabinet. However, in a classic case of keeping up appearances, Mrs Thatcher said that President Reagan, in effect, complied with the treaty thereby keeping open an opportunity for the Soviet Union to comply with the treaty too. The deputy leader of the parliamentary opposition, Roy Hattersley, was quick to remark that both parliament and the nation realized well why the prime minister was reluctant to answer the question directly. The opposition leader then asked why the prime minister humiliated herself and the entire country by doing everything to please President Reagan.

The same mood is widely spread in other countries of the old world. The British newspaper, THE GUARDIAN, says that Europe will be fighting desperately for the SALT II Treaty. It says that this is a fight that cannot be shirked and that it is to be waged in earnest.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

FINLAND'S LEADING PAPER CRITICIZES U.S. SALT-II STAND

Helsinki HELSINKY SANOMAT in Finnish 1 Jun 86 p 2

[Editorial: "Reagan's Poker Game"]

[Text] President Ronald Reagan appears to have decided to play superpower poker for such high stakes that all of his NATO allies are scared stiff. At the beginning of the week Washington single-handedly torpedoed the joint final agreement reached at the CSCE conference in Bern. Now Reagan has announced that he will cease respecting the SALT-2 agreement by the end of the year unless a noticeable change in Soviet policy takes place.

The United States has never officially ratified the agreement. Nevertheless, Reagan has up to now promised to comply with it as long as the Soviet Union does the same. This tacit mutual understanding has all along been viewed as a ray of light in the tense relations between the two countries.

Reagan's threat is not his first, nor will it necessarily even be his last word. Worrisome enough is, however, the public contempt with which Washington has reacted to the SALT agreement.

The reason for removing from use the two Poseidon nuclear submarines was not, according to the government, a desire to comply with the SALT agreement, but an effort to be able to economize on expenses. They can soon be replaced with much cheaper cruise missiles. On the other hand, in Secretary of State George Schultz's opinion, "in times of tight budgets it makes no sense to destroy otherwise good weapons in order to remain below some artificial limit."

Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev has been unwilling to confirm the date of his originally agreed-on visit to the United States this year before he gets public proof of Reagan's readiness to seek agreement. Reagan, however, seems to have chosen a quite different tactic, the risks of which are obvious in light of the history of relations between the superpowers to date. This is why Schultz had occasion to note at the NATO conference of foreign ministers that U.S. policy failed to receive a favorable response even among the United States' own allies.

11,466
CSO: 5200/2699

SALT/START ISSUES

PAPER PROPOSES FINNISH GOVERNMENT INITIATE SALT COMPLIANCE

Helsinki HELSINKIN SANOMAT in Finnish 8 Jun 86 p 2

[Editorial: "Finland's Turn to Promote Disarmament"; first paragraph is HELSINKIN SANOMAT introduction]

[Text] Winds carried nuclear fallout from Chernobyl in the direction of Europe in a few weeks time. There is reason for countries outside [the Soviet Union] that have suffered from this to put together their experiences and offer them to the superpowers to be applied on behalf of disarmament.

For the past few weeks the superpower summit conference has been moved farther and farther behind an unknown horizon. The Soviet Union has not received a response to its proposals for a summit conference on one issue. As for the United States, it has threatened to scrap the SALT-2 agreement and has decided to go ahead and manufacture new chemical warfare weapons under the protection of the reluctant consent it has squirmed out of its allies. Both sides are certainly to blame for the impasse, although right now President Ronald Reagan and the forces that support him seem to be a prototype of the opponents of detente and those who engage in the sumo race.

The U.S. leader's way of ungraciously shrugging his shoulders at concerned Europeans has been condemned throughout the continent. President Reagan's way of thinking is neither understandable nor acceptable. Right now, however, after Chernobyl, it would be appropriate for national leaders to realize the extreme power of destruction of nuclear fallout.

We do not yet know what all the consequences of the Chernobyl accident will be. We must, however, assume that, in freely getting out of hand, the fire probably released much large amounts of pollutants that a large part of Europe may not, at least not this year, be able to lead a normal life or feed itself. We were very close to a catastrophe affecting half the continent, but fortunately it was only a dress rehearsal.

Is it not possible precisely now, in the wake of Chernobyl, to apply the knowledge produced by the nuclear power plant accident in estimating the potential destruction that would be caused by a nuclear war? A war waged with only a few nuclear weapons would mean Chernobyl many times over for the continent.

It would be a situation we would be incapable of controlling. Is it not quite clear that rejection of the SALT-2 agreement and the new round of nuclear armament that it might result in would only mean that we would sink deeper than before into an impasse?

The people of the continent's concern over nuclear weapons might now perhaps be usefully channeled into an investigation of the consequences of Chernobyl. Active steps ought to be expected above all by the countries that have suffered from the Chernobyl accident, countries that should have reason to meet to investigate the consequences of the accident.

Such a conference should draft a report on the threat of nuclear fallout, the effects of a nuclear war and, therefore, the utter impossibility of employing nuclear weapons if we want to continue to lead a normal life on this continent. The purpose of the conference should be to make an appeal to the United States on behalf of reasonable disarmament and first and foremost to avoid a new round of nuclear armament.

The polluted nations outside [the Soviet Union] extend from Northern Finland, Sweden and Denmark through Eastern and Central Europe all the way to the Mediterranean. At least Poland, both Germanies, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia, Italy and France have had to publicly or secretly resort to some safety measures. The experiences of these nations and peoples constitute a case from which we must be able to draw conclusions with regard to the use of nuclear weapons as well.

A full understanding of the accident will be of common international benefit. It will serve the cause of common safety and it is a unique occasion, one that can get the countries of Eastern and Western Europe together to speak for the continent's entire population. A conference of those who are suffering in place of others, one that serves the future, may also be of avail in effecting a superpower summit conference.

We can well conceive of Finland as the country to call such a conference. Finland's foreign policy leadership now has an opportunity to make a constructive contribution on behalf of disarmament.

11,466
CSO: 5200/2702

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET PAPER RAPS PERLE, ADELMAN CALLS FOR CONTINUED TESTING

Moscow GUDOK in Russian 16 May 86 p 3

[Article by N. Novlyanskiy: "The Solicitous Mr. Perle"]

[Text] There are few who would call Richard Perle, U. S. Assistant Secretary of Defense, an advocate of peace and tranquility. American newspapers at times dub him the "Prince of Darkness." This is, no doubt, because he usually directly and with satanic persistence attempts to interfere with the establishment of good relations between our countries. And he manages to do this everywhere, from trade to politics.

And suddenly, what a thing to happen! Mr. Perle expresses his extreme concern about the possibility of an accidental nuclear war. Moreover, he wishes to increase the level of security in the world. He states for all to hear: "It is most likely that nuclear weapons will be used as a result of some accident, and we must prevent this."

But how? Destroy such weapons altogether? No, from Perle's point of view, this would mean to become inferior to the "reds." And he proposes a method: continue nuclear testing.

For (think about such distorted logic!) without testing it is not possible to be confident that American warheads are in order. One of them, you see, might sit and sit on the stockpile and explode! And a worldwide row will begin. Therefore, from time to time it is necessary to explode them in order that "no difficulties take place with them."

How many nights did he have to lay awake in order to think up such a thing! By the way, Richard Perle is not alone today in wandering about seeking arguments in favor of continuing nuclear testing. The Soviet Union is not only not hastening to resume testing, it even decided to extend its unilateral moratorium until 6 August. Judging by everything, this fact is placing an ever heavier burden on Washington.

Another authority hurries to the assistance of the assistant secretary: Kenneth Adelman, director of the U. S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. "Concluding a treaty about a complete ban on nuclear testing," he stated in one of the Senate committees a few days ago, "continues to be a long-range

objective of the United States." The senators, who some time ago passed an advisory resolution on this matter, understandably had to breathe more easily. But this did not happen. "We believe," continued Adelman, "that this ban should be viewed in the context of a period when we no longer need to rely on nuclear means of deterrence to ensure international security and stability, and when we achieve broad, substantial and verifiable arms reductions and substantially improve capabilities for verification and achieve a more stable equality in nonnuclear forces."

His head is spinning in fever! In Ancient Rome in such cases they talked much more succinctly: Let us put the matter off until the first day of the Greek calendar. And in Ancient Rus we said: Until the last day that carrots can be eaten. In short, we will never do this.

But, you see, even here they cannot get by without mentioning "security" and "stability." The level of concern about peace is rising in Washington right before our eyes. They explode some nuclear "piece" in Nevada, and before the ground has even cooled they are baking their next propaganda pie with intricate vignettes of verbal sugar.

And what can they say if there is nothing to say? Adelman, it is true, did not outdo Perle, but nevertheless he tried to find one more "argument." Nuclear tests, he said, are necessary... "to guarantee the survivability of nonnuclear forces and the command and control system." Bravo!

To what vagaries this situation brings other politicians. It is a situation in which they can no longer say frankly: "All of you disarmament zealots go to the devil! We have exploded them and we will explode them!"

9069
CSO: 5200/1407

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: WARSAW PACT PROPOSAL, REAGAN SALT II DECISION CONTRASTED

PM171007 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "The Times Dictate Imperatively"]

[Text] The attention of the entire world was focused on Budapest in the last few days. Reports came from there about the progress of the friendly visit to Hungary by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Here, in the capital of People's Bulgaria, a conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee [PCC] was held, and showed the peoples of Europe and the entire planet the way to a future without wars or weapons.

Perhaps not everyone noticed the routine session, also held during these days, of the FRG cabinet, which was held on this occasion on Defense Ministry premises. Of course, this session in Bonn is not commensurate with what was happening in Budapest, either in scale or in significance. In a sense the fact that these events coincided is highly indicative. It vividly illuminates the diametrically opposite approaches to the most acute problems of today on the part of the Warsaw Pact Organization and the NATO bloc. On the banks of the Danube the discussion was of how to protect the world from nuclear catastrophe and remove the threat of war that hangs over mankind. On the banks of the Rhine, it was of the "need" to "substantially increase" the combat potential of the NATO countries' armed forces, and in particular West Germany's Bundeswehr.

Yes, that is the dialectic of present-day world development. The USSR and the other socialist community states persistently and tirelessly seek paths that open up, for all people, bright prospects for the future.

This is the aim of the Soviet Union's large-scale, far-reaching initiatives and proposals, which have the full support and approval of its allied and friends -- from the simplest proposal of banning all nuclear explosions to the program for the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction by the end of the second millennium and the elaboration of the fundamentals for the creation of an all-embracing system of international security.

As for the capitalist countries, their ruling circles are not concerned about mankind's future, but about losing their own domination of mankind. They seek to regain their lost positions and achieve social revenge. They consider the sole means of implementing their designs to be the acquisition of military superiority over the socialist world, in order to attempt to realize their class objectives by force.

The United States and those who are in power in the largest and strongest country of the capitalist world, are particularly stubborn. They are unwilling to reckon with the will of the people. They pursue a dangerous course in foreign policy, leading to the intensification of tension in the international situation.

The United States has launched an unprecedented arms race, above all a nuclear arms race, and nurtures plans for the militarization of space and the siting of space-strike weapons in orbits around the earth. The essentials are not changed by the fact that Washington sometimes openly brags about its strong-arm approach to the most important international problems. Sometimes, for tactical reasons, hypocritically conceals it behind mellifluous assurances of "peaceability" and the desire to do no more than "deter" the Soviet Union, from where an all but "lethal threat" supposedly emanates.

An example of this ambivalent approach by Washington to the formulation of its own policy is provided by the recently published annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to Congress. It expounds the administration's position on questions of military building, foreign policy, and the approach to Soviet-American talks. Among other issues, the authors of the report touched on the problems of ending nuclear tests. While stubbornly continuing the tests, people across the ocean cannot, however, simply shrug aside the unilateral Soviet moratorium, and they seek any justification for their course. So how do they "justify" the continuing nuclear explosions at the Nevada range? They justify it as a means of "ensuring the reliability and effectiveness of the deterrent."

What this "deterrent" is, was decoded by the American press itself. It is the new nuclear warheads for MX ICBM's, Midgetman mobile missiles, ballistic missiles for Trident-2 nuclear submarines (D-5), 155- and 2-3.2-mm nuclear artillery shells, anti-submarine nuclear depth charges, B-61 and B-83 nuclear bombs, and so on, and so forth. It goes without saying that all this has nothing to do with "deterrence," to use this same, widespread American term. It does have a very great deal to do with plans for a first nuclear strike. That cannot be concealed behind any cunning terms.

Perhaps the most vivid manifestation of Washington's sinister course of extending the nuclear arms race is to be found in the U.S. President's decision to renounce observance of the Soviet-American SALT II Agreement. Commenting on this decision, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR wrote that it is causing alarm in both the United States and Western Europe, since it "increases the risk of an unrestricted arms race." That is indeed so. E. Rowley, special adviser to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms reduction talks, states frankly that the renunciation of the policy of observing SALT II will be advantageous to the United States and its allies and is a "promising option," since it will "enable the United States to modernize its strategic forces." Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle even issued a kind of ultimatum to those congressmen who permitted themselves to doubt the wisdom of the President's decision. "Congress will either side with the administration, or it will be siding with the Soviet Union."

So that is the outcome of the logic of militarists and militarism. An unrestricted race for offensive nuclear arms, the militarization of space, preparations for chemical warfare, the creation of conventional weapons with potential approximating that of nuclear weapons, and the transformation of entire continents into advance posts for U.S. nuclear strategy, spiced with the doctrine of neoglobalism and the policy of state terrorism -- that is the reality mankind faces.

In this connection I remember an article published in the West German magazine STERN. It was devoted to the White House's policy. The author started his argument with eloquent statistics: In a year, 77 people are killed by hand-held firearms; in Britain, 8; in Switzerland, 24; in Canada, 8; and in the United States, 11,522. These figures confirm that weapons and the use of force have become a cult in America. Violence, the author writes, is as normal as Coca-Cola in that country. The White House carried over this cult of weapons, this gamble on brute force, into all its policy. "It is leaving unanswered the Soviet Union's disarmament proposals. It is continuing to test its nuclear weapons. It is implementing its monstrous SDI program, even at the cost of breaking off disarmament talks with the Soviet Union. In a word, it regards muscle as a political tool and not only acts like a thug, but is one, where subtle political actions are needed.

A murderous characteristic.

The world has entered a phase of its development in which to avoid solving the vital issues of today is to jeopardize the future of all civilization. As the Warsaw Pact PCC conference in Budapest showed that the socialist countries are well aware of that fact and act accordingly. The conference supported the program put forward by the USSR for the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction, the concrete steps to end nuclear tests, and the position of the Soviet delegation at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Thus the participants in the Warsaw Pact consider it their duty persistently and consistently to seek the elimination of the nuclear threat, a change for the better in European and world affairs, and the development of fruitful cooperation between states.

What are the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states calling for? An end to nuclear tests. The total elimination, on a reciprocal basis, of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone. The attainment of concrete accords at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms. The elimination, in this century, of another type of weapons of mass destruction, namely chemical weapons, as well as the industrial base for their manufacture. A substantial reduction in armed forces and armaments at the global and regional levels. The implementation of effective monitoring in all spheres and at all stages of arms reduction and disarmament.

The Warsaw Pact states named the strengthening of security and cooperation in Europe as one of the central tasks of their foreign policy. For many years now the two strongest military-political groups -- the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc -- have faced each other on the European Continent, and here large armed forces of both sides are concentrated. The press has already cited the information that NATO (counting France and Spain) has 94 divisions here, while the Warsaw Pact countries have 78. The Warsaw Pact countries have a large tank pool but the NATO countries' tank pool yields nothing to it in quantity, now including 17,000 machines directly in combat formations and units, and 8,000 in store. As for aircraft, in general both sides have large and approximately equal air forces. NATO has a slight superiority in fighter-bombers and assault aircraft, while the Warsaw Pact has more fighter-interceptors.

Thus there is an approximate equilibrium between NATO forces and Warsaw Pact forces in Europe, an equilibrium at a very high and dangerous level. In view of this and considering the need for concrete measures aimed at ensuring the transition to effective disarmament, the Budapest PCC conference adopted an "Appeal of the Warsaw Pact States to the NATO States and to European Countries, With a Program for Reducing Armed Forces and Armaments in Europe." It is proposed to substantially reduce all components of ground forces and tactical assault aircraft of the European states, as well as the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces and means stationed in Europe, and operational-tactical nuclear arms with a range (radius of operation) of up to 1,000 km. As a result of these measures by the beginning of the nineties this reduction would amount to more than half a million people on each side.

The appeal of the Warsaw Pact states indicates concrete ways of implementing these proposals. Their realism and viability immediately attracted the keenest attention among the European public and all the international public. "The broad scope of this program," Britain's DAILY MAIL notes, "stunned NATO observers." Well, maybe. We shall see how they react in practice.

Meanwhile the socialist countries continue their peace offensive. As M.S. Gorbachev announced during the rally at the Csepel machine tool plant, the Soviet Union has submitted a proposal of fundamental importance at the United Nations. Its essence, in brief, is simple: to make space an arena of "star peace," not "star wars." In other words, the USSR proposes the total exclusion of space from the sphere of military preparations and its utilization solely for peaceful purposes.

In all the steps taken by the Soviet Union and the other socialist states in the international arena one can see the highest sense of responsibility for mankind's future, for its peace and tranquillity. The struggle for these lofty goals is not easy. It requires a supreme intensity of effort, high vigilance, selflessness, and readiness to accomplish feats for the sake of the future. But there simply is no other means of protecting the world from catastrophe. The times dictate imperatively: Act.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW: WARSAW PACT PROPOSALS, INF, SDI

LD140352 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Jun 86

[*"International Situation: Questions and Answers"* program presented by Pavel Kasparov, foreign policy commentator of All-Union Radio, with Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political observer; Boris Andrianov, commentator of All-Union Radio; Vladimir Tsvetov, political observer of All-Union Radio and Central Television; and Nikolay Agayants, who is not further identified--recorded]

[Excerpt] [Kasparov] Hello, dear comrades. I would like to start this program by talking about the results of the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. I shall be helped in this by TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov. Yuriy Immanuilovich, the results of the committee's conference are being widely commented on not only by us at home, but everywhere abroad. What can you say about that?

[Kornilov] There have been very many reactions to this event. Of course, they are not all the same. Their tone and inclination depends on what circles, what forces stand behind this or that mass information organ and whose positions they reflect. But to pick the main thing out of the stream of reports arriving from various countries, there is every reason to say that the Budapest forum, which was held in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely, businesslike cooperation, and the Soviet-Hungarian talks, were assessed in the world as a call to action, as a new convincing proof of the profound desire for peace of socialist policy and diplomacy, as a clear demonstration of the unity of views of the socialist states on problems of European and world policy.

Eminent political and public figures of various countries and mass media are stressing that the decisions and initiatives approved in Budapest reflect the unwavering aspiration of the fraternal parties and countries to consolidate peace, strengthen the unity and interaction of the socialist community. And this is indeed so. The Budapest forum discussed a whole series of big and important problems. They were topical questions of strengthening the unity and cohesion of the Warsaw Pact member-states, the position in Europe, the problems of restructuring international relations, ways of eliminating hotbeds of tension and tasks of normalizing international economic relations. But whatever the questions examined at the committee conference, the center of attention unfailingly remained the one most important, most burning, the truly pivotal problem of today -- the problem of putting a brake on the arms race unleashed by imperialism, consolidating peace and ensuring reliable security of peoples.

The countries taking part in the Budapest forum emphasized that they consider it their duty to strive insistently and consistently to eliminate the nuclear threat, for a turn for the better in European and world affairs, for the development of fruitful cooperation between states. They confirmed their desire for the creation of a universal system of international security covering both the military-political and the economic and humanitarian spheres. They came out resolutely in favor of continuing and deepening political dialogue between states with differing social systems, of giving it the maximum specificity of character. The foreign policy line of the fraternal countries, expressed in the decisions of the congresses of their ruling parties, is targeted at building a world that is safe for everyone, a world without wars and without weapons.

[Kasparov] Yuriy Immanuilovich, what can you tell us about the most basic foreign policy tasks that today face the states of the world; in what directions, in the view of the socialist countries, should their efforts be combined and concentrated?

[Kornilov] The reply to this question was formulated with the utmost precision in the Budapest communique. It is essential to aim for a cessation of nuclear tests. This would undoubtedly be a big step toward nuclear disarmament and would become an obstacle in the perfecting of nuclear weapons and creating new types. What is needed is the full elimination -- on a mutual basis, of course -- of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone, with the understanding that Britain and France will not increase their corresponding nuclear weapons and the United States will not pass its missiles, both strategic and medium-range, to other countries. The Warsaw Pact member-states are in favor of achieving concrete accords at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons which would take account of the interests of both sides and all other states, confirming their adherence to the treaties and agreements in the area of arms limitation and disarmament, and insistently calling on the United States for strict observance of the SALT agreement. The socialist countries are in favor of the elimination in this century of mass destruction weapons such as chemical ones, and also the industrial basis for their manufacture. They favor a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional weapons at the global and regional levels. It would be advisable to start in such a reduction in Europe, for it is precisely here that the concentration of troops and weapons has reached especially dangerous levels. Having stressed that Warsaw Pact member-states consider that one of the central tasks of their foreign policy is the strengthening of security and cooperation in Europe, the participants in the conference adopted, as is known, an appeal to the NATO member-states and to all European countries, which proposes a substantial reduction of all land forces and tactical strike aircraft of European states, and also of the corresponding forces and hardware of the United States and Canada stationed in Europe. At the same time as conventional weapons, there would also be a reduction in operational-tactical nuclear weapons.

This appeal, it must be said, has already received the widest positive reaction, not only in Europe, but also far beyond. The appeal, noted the British paper MORNING STAR, is an important, weighty addition to the program put forward by the Soviet Union for the elimination of mass destruction weapons.

Practical steps for the reduction of weapons and disarmament will allow enormous material, financial, and human resources to be freed for peaceful, constructive goals, including the elimination of economic backwardness in many parts of the world, the Budapest communique notes. The truly enormous resources in question can be conceived by the following figures, for example: At present there are \$800 billion thrown into the bottomless pit of the arms race each year in the world. This is one approach to the pivotal problems of today, an approach dictated by concern for peace, deep understanding of the fact that precisely disarmament is the high road to the building of a secure world. This approach, as we have already said, is welcomed by all who hold dear a clear sky over the planet.

But it is now provoking a different, directly opposite reaction in certain imperialist circles. The hopes of the peoples for real steps toward disarmament and a return to detente engendered by the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva and the accords reached in principle at it have so far not been justified. Precisely for this reason the participants in the Budapest forum expressed serious concern at the fact that in connection with the actions of the United States and NATO an alarming -- I say extremely alarming -- situation has come about in the world.

[Kasparov] And here it seems to me that it is time to be precise about which specific actions of the opponents of detente and peace we are talking about.

[Kornilov] Washington and its NATO allies -- and this was specially noted in the Budapest communique -- are refusing to embark on putting a brake on the arms race and halting nuclear tests. They are evading a constructive reply to such a big initiative as the program proposed by the Soviet Union for a full elimination of mass destruction weapons by the end of the century. The siting in Europe of U.S. medium-range missiles is continuing. There is an increase in manifestations of the imperialist policy of force and crude interference in the affairs of other states. A special danger for the fate of the world is represented by the U.S. program of preparing for star wars, which Washington is continuing to implement at an increased pace. I remind you that it is planned to spend \$26 billion in the near future, and over the decade 1984-93, \$60 billion on the implementation of this program. Implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative invented by Washington involves powerful military-industrial concerns of the United States and a number of other NATO countries.

[Kasparov] Yuriy Immanuilovich, the populations of the U.S. NATO allies are now being persuaded -- or rather, having it actively dinned into them -- that the level of security of those countries in the event of the implementation of the American so-called star wars program would supposedly increase. But this is a deliberate lie.

[Kornilov] Of course. Assertions that, allegedly, the star wars program will strengthen the security of the NATO states are absolutely groundless, for it is more than obvious that the creation [sozdaniye], within the framework of the so-called SDI, of space weapons being developed [razrabatyvayemykh] as a more dangerous equivalent of nuclear weapons would signify -- and this was stressed with all force in Budapest -- that the arms race will take on unprecedented dimensions, and the continuation of the process of limiting and reducing weapons will become virtually impossible.

But such a turn of affairs can surely not strengthen the security of states -- the more so those which are directly participating in the implementation of SDI. Of course not. On the contrary, the level of their security will diminish, and diminish considerably. Indeed, what talk can there be about a peaceful future, what security, what strategic stability at all, if the missiles which are already in the bottom of mines and depths of the oceans are topped up with yet another mortal threat to hang over mankind, from space?

[Kasparov] Another question: The Budapest forum resolutely came out in favor of the total elimination on a mutual basis of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone. But after all, Britain and France also have nuclear weapons.

[Kornilov] Yes, they do. These nuclear weapons, as is known, at present are not the subject of negotiations. The USSR position on the problem is this: The main thing is to ensure that the Anglo-French nuclear potential should not increase if the USSR and United States destroy their medium-range missiles. But the Soviet Union is ready to go further still. Our country, as is known, has already proposed to London that if it rejects nuclear weapons, the USSR will reduce its nuclear weapons, of course on a commensurate scale. We are ready to start talks with both Britain and France on mutual, step-by-step and equivalent reduction of nuclear forces on the principles of identical security, and, of course, under reliable supervision. And here, as we see, it is up to the West.

Speaking in Budapest, at Csepel, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated that in the coming days the Soviet Union would put forward at the United Nations a proposal of important principle -- to make space an arena for star peace, and not an arena for star wars. And this initiative has already been put forward, which immediately provoked huge interest in the broad international public. Comparing today the attitudes of the USSR and United States on problems of space, their approach to such a major problem as the banning of all nuclear tests, their position on other aspects of disarmament, all honest, sober-minded people, all who are not deafened, not confused by the massive and thoroughly false NATO propaganda, are again and again convinced as to who is consistently waging the struggle for peace, for dismantling the material apparatus of war, and who is acting on the international scene as the engine of militarism, continuing in spite of reason to see force and the nuclear space stick as virtually the only argument in relations with sovereign countries and peoples.

[Kasparov] I would like to stress that at the moment, many observers are noting in their despatches in connection with this, that the Budapest forum once again pointed out the need to take account of the realities of the nuclear age.

[Kornilov] That's right. In today's world, when such mountains of arms have been accumulated that, were they put into action, the very future of human civilization would be threatened, there is no sensible alternative to peaceful coexistence of states. Today more than ever it is necessary to strictly observe the principle of respecting national independence and sovereignty, nonuse of force or the threat of force, the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, peaceful settling of disputes, and the principle of noninterference in internal affairs, of equality, and other generally recognized norms of international relations. The Political Consultative Committee conference participants stressed their firm conviction that reliable security for all countries and peoples, and peaceful conditions for their development and progress, can be ensured only by political means, only by joint efforts of all states.

Of course, the process of forming and asserting such a new way of political thinking is a very complicated matter.

What is inevitable here is fierce clashes, sharp discussion, and painful differences; but nevertheless, confronted by the threat of nuclear apocalypse, mankind is beginning to comprehend a simple truth: In order to survive, one must proceed in international relations not from narrowly understood interests, setting countries and peoples off against each other, but from interests and aspirations that are common to all. Clear evidence of this is the fact that even today we can quite justifiably talk about energetic and broad support in the world for the wide-ranging proposals and initiatives which the socialist countries put forward in Budapest. Further clear evidence of this

is the strengthening front of active fighters for peace, into the ranks of which ever more millions of people are pouring. Nobody would be able to halt the peace offensive of the Warsaw Pact, the Hungarian NEPSZABADSAG newspaper writes in its leading article. This is well said.

The cardinal task of our time, the Budapest communique says, is to protect peace, stop the arms race, and go on to specific measures of disarmament, first and foremost in the nuclear sphere. This task can be accomplished. It is possible to stop the tendency toward an increasing danger of war and return international relations to the channel of detente; mankind can and must block the path toward nuclear catastrophe. This extremely precise formulation expresses the very essence of socialist foreign policy, a policy which has the aim of doing everything possible in order to make a reliable road for mankind into a future that will not have any place for weapons and war.

[Kasparov] Thank you.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW: WARSAW PACT PROPOSALS, SALT II

LD151702 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 15 Jun 86

[*"International Observers Round Table"* program with Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, APN political observer; Radomir Georgiyevich Bagdanov, deputy director of the USA and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political observer of Central Television and All-Union Radio]

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello, comrades: The main event of the past week -- and one that is going to occupy people's minds for a very long time to come -- was, of course, the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. On more than one occasion already coordinated actions on the international arena by the socialist states have made it possible to successfully accomplish many very great and very complicated tasks in international politics. One only has to recall the successful holding of the All-European Conference on Security and Cooperation. The present conference has continued this tradition. Those taking part in it put forward wide-scale and very specific proposals, which, if they are implemented, will not merely lower the level of military danger and military tension in Europe but will also move fulfillment of the program for the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons a long way forward.

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir Yakovlevich, we have seen, so to speak, the completion of a whole program which was put forward by the Soviet Union in recent years. I will take the April 1985 plenum as a starting point: There it was formulated quite precisely that the Soviet Union resolutely rejects the policy of confrontation and puts forward a whole series of proposals aimed at international detente in general and at European security, the strengthening of European security in particular. The major event that followed the April plenum was the well-known statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January this year, when a comprehensive program for nuclear disarmament was put forward. Our listeners remember that the point of this program is to put an end to nuclear weapons by the end of the century, by the end of the nineties. We have made great efforts to explain this program and to bring it home to our partners in the West and in the United States. We have done a tremendous amount in order to get this program operating in the appropriate atmosphere, to give it reality. And we took a major step which goes hand in hand with these major measures -- we declared a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests.

[Tsvetov] On all tests of nuclear weapons.

[Bogdanov] On all tests of nuclear weapons. But one of the main objections of our Western partners -- both in the United States and in Western Europe -- lay in the fact that, yes, of course, these proposals are interesting, these proposals really do include a rational core, but there is one "but" and this "but" amounts to this, that the Soviet Union allegedly has such a superiority in land forces, primarily in the European theater, that in the event of nuclear disarmament the Soviet Union will supposedly be the only one to gain. And of course this circumstance has been taken fully into consideration in the appeal by the Warsaw Pact member-states which raises the issue of reducing over a period of 1-2 years the armed forces of the opposing blocs by 100,000-150,000 men. And I would like to point out that it is not simply a question of reducing numbers of troops but of reducing their weapons too: And it is especially stressed that tactical air forces would be reduced, as well.

[Tsvetov] I would like to say that there is a very important principle here.

What is the idea that we are putting forward in this appeal? It is the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments on a basis of equal quantities and equal percentages.

[Beglov] And, of course, it is very important also to stress other aspects of the program put forward by the members of the Warsaw Pact, the fact that it makes it possible to resolve issues of disarmament and security in Europe as a single set of issues, on a wide scale. It is very important to stress this because questions might arise. I do not rule out these questions being asked by some of our listeners, too. For example: Why is it necessary to have new proposals of talks are already taking place, if the talks process -- as present-day usage has it -- is already under way, both in Stockholm where confidence-building, security, and disarmament measures for the whole of Europe are being examined; and in Vienna where they have been marking time already for 12 and 1/2 years without having been able in any way to resolve questions concerning the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Talks concerning Europe are taking place at the Geneva disarmament conference, and so on. And so I would say that the special significance, the new quality, I would say, in these proposals which were put forward by the Warsaw Pact on 11 June lies in the fact that they make it possible to resolve on an integrated basis both questions concerning reductions -- and substantial reductions at that -- in land forces -- and not just within a narrow zone in central Europe, it refers to the whole of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals: And this program also proposes that new content should be given to the talks that have been started in Stockholm on measures for strengthening confidence and on security and disarmament. Here it is also being proposed at issues concerning the provision of real measures for disarmament should be resolved at the same time, together with confidence measures, either within the framework of this conference or at a special forum, because the issue is an urgent one. And what is very important is the fact that the program takes notice of the fact that so-called conventional weapons have become closer in their characteristics to weapons of mass destruction. It is quite right, therefore, that this proposal, that this program, should be regarded as a worthy completion, at any rate as a worthy addition to the wide program of measures for real disarmament which has been put forward by the Soviet Union and its socialist allies.

[Bogdanov] I would like to add, Spartak Ivanovich, that this program essentially covers all the main directions of the arms race: More accurately, it places very strong barriers on all the main directions of the arms race. I would like to remind you that the Soviet proposal on peaceful space was put forward at the United Nations almost simultaneously with this appeal -- the proposal on how the space problem should be solved. Thus, one can consider it to be completed because it cuts off all the most dangerous directions that currently exist in the arms race. And it seems to me that another important thing is what you have said about what is new in this program: for so far -- it has to be admitted, there is no point in hiding it -- so far, there has existed in Europe a feeling, so to speak, that a sudden attack is possible. Moreover, neither have we been free of concern on this score, concern that a sudden attack might be launched against the Soviet Union by the forces of the NATO countries. And so we are proposing, we are introducing two new elements into this program. We are talking about reducing tactical air forces, that is to say the component of the armed forces which is used for launching sudden strikes -- including sudden nuclear strikes -- against enemy forces. And the second thing that we are proposing is a reduction in the concentration of troops -- this is an extremely important proposal -- at the line where they come into contact with each other. This is the most dangerous sector of the central European theater, where the countries of the Warsaw Pact stand literally face to face in confrontation with soldiers belonging to the countries of the Atlantic pact. This lifting of the feeling of crisis, this is the creation of the kind of atmosphere in which it is possible to conduct fruitful talks.

[Tsvetov] Correct. The appeal therefore also speaks in specific terms about military confidence-building measures, that is to say it has in mind the earliest possible fore-warning of different types of military activity: For it is no secret that the holding of major maneuvers in Europe is now accompanied by the participation of hundreds and thousands of men, thousands of tanks, thousands of aircraft. And just imagine what it is like when such maneuvers begin. Is it not only to be expected that a state situated next to the area where these maneuvers are being held will ask whether or not an attack is being prepared?

[Beglov] Furthermore, at the time that the Conference on Confidence-Building and Security and Disarmament in Europe was starting in Stockholm, the Soviet Union put forward a proposal that these measures must without fail include provision for restricting the scale of military activity by states, and primarily the scale of military maneuvers and military exercises of all kinds, troop movements, and so on because NATO activity in this respect, the things that NATO does, do indeed create an atmosphere that might get out of control. If, therefore, one is going to speak about the threat to the socialist states and the Warsaw Pact countries in light of the large-scale military exercises and events held by NATO, then I would say that this is filled with more serious substance -- endless military maneuvers, endless build-up of military activity.

[Tsvetov] Thus, the measures proposed in Budapest in connection with the military confidence-building measures are aimed precisely at lowering the level of suspicion and hence at strengthening confidence and security. But the appeal by the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty to the member-states of NATO contains another very important element, the serious -- and, I would say, the very extensive proposal on monitoring implementation of arms reductions.

[Bogdanov] You know, in the United States, Vladimir Yakovlevich, there exists a whole network of state establishments, research centers, so-called amateur groups which are engaged exclusively in seeking out nonexistent examples of violations by the Soviet Union of existing agreements. Moreover, a striking form of logic is used as a guide, both at the level of the state and at the level of these so-called private research centers: The Soviet Union is a godless state, people there do not believe in God, therefore, they cannot be trusted. And this logic has penetrated the thinking of the whole of the ruling group which today sits in the White House. The American side does not have at its disposal one single fact that is really capable of exposing the Soviet Union in violation of those treaties which bear its signature. We have explained to the Americans repeatedly, both at the level of the Special Consultative Committee in Geneva and at other levels, that we are, by all means, willing to reply to any questions you may have, to all your accusations on violations. But we understand, we understand that by virtue of its ideological hyper-hardheadedness, so to speak, the American side might indeed consider that there is no other way of dealing with these godless people, one can only distrust them. And so we are proposing a very broad spectrum of monitoring measures, ranging from international inspections to on-site inspection. And the third section of this appeal has, in my view, colossal significance for the practical implementation of our proposals: It is a well-balanced system of measures for monitoring the reductions being carried out and the troop limitations in the European theater.

What does this envisage? It envisages, for the purposes of monitoring, the setting up of an international consultative commission on which the NATO countries and the countries of the Warsaw Pact would be represented, as well as interested neutral and non-aligned European states. In this way, monitoring becomes an international problem. It is no longer a question of the United States and the Soviet Union: It is thousands of eyes of other peoples that have an interest in ensuring that these highly important agreements are implemented.

More than that, the third section states that if the measures we propose, including on-site inspection, are not satisfactory in the West, we are open to discussion of any other proposals on any other proposals on monitoring measures. The principle is very simple: We are no less interested in monitoring than is the American side, but even more so.

[Tsvetov] More so.

[Bogdanov] And we have considerably more grounds, by virtue of our historical experience, not to trust the American side than the American side has not to trust the Soviet Union.

[Tsvetov] And, indeed, it is the United States that has sited first-strike nuclear weapons next to our borders. Reagan's announcement of withdrawal from the SALT II treaty shows that the United States is intent upon an uncontrolled build-up of more and more new weapons systems. How, then, can we do without thorough monitoring? It is impossible.

[Beglov] There is another aspect of the program proposed by the Warsaw Pact countries that I think we should mention. That program is not confined exclusively to the military-strategic sphere -- it touches on very important political elements. It is, in effect, a program of political cooperation among the countries of Europe in the field of disarmament -- of cooperation, moreover, between such seemingly quite incompatible formations or organizations as NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization.

If we are talking about the main obstacle in the way of resolving questions of disarmament and security, then NATO has, in effect -- and I am also referring to the North Atlantic alliance as a whole -- turned into a sort of appendage of the conveyor belt of the arms race: an adjunct to the military machine that is controlled by the United States, to the military programs that are dreamed up by the Pentagon. The Atlantic alliance has been deprived of any possibility of putting forward political initiatives. As the Europeans themselves have lately begun to notice, it has been emasculated: All political content has been removed.

What sparked off this particular explosion and alarm was the Washington administration's announcement of its intention to cease observing the SALT II treaty. This is the moment of truth that opened the eyes of the West Europeans to the fact that, as appendages of the military machine, they have been put in a position where they do not decide their own destiny.

[Tsvetov] Sorry to interrupt. I would like to cite in this connection a very interesting quotation from the West German magazine, STERN. It wrote, in connection with President Reagan's announcement of withdrawal from the SALT II treaty: We have had another accident -- this time in the United States, and not at a nuclear electronic power station, but at the command center of world politics. The safety fuses of reason have blown. What is even worse, they have simply been pulled out of their sockets; and the man responsible is Ronald Reagan.

[Bogdanov] Incidentally, the great novelty of the appeal is in the fact that its fifth section deals with a subject that we have never before touched on, namely military doctrines. And yet it is precisely military doctrines that set the weapons in motion -- directing them and determining how they are used and applied and so on.

[Tsvetov] It is truly said, after all, that wars begin in men's minds, first of all.

[Bogdanov] Quite right, quite right, Vladimir Yakovlevich. And that is why we say that in the interests of security, both in Europe and in the wholeworld, the military concepts and doctrines of the military alliances must be based on principles of defense. From that, very serious practical conclusions follow. If the sides agree on such an approach, then it follows that a reconstruction of armed forces should take place in accordance with the defensive nature of those doctrines.

In the same fifth point there is something that I think is very important, and I want to read it out to our listeners straight from the text: There it says that the members of the Warsaw Pact are guided by peaceful intentions. The member countries of NATO also declare that their alliance is defensive.

It follows from this that there should be no obstacles to substantial mutual reductions of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. I think the logic of that is unassailable.

[Tsvetov] But there is also a peculiarity here. The last thing that the United States is thinking about in its doctrines and its foreign policy concepts is defense. Let me quote a very interesting statement by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. He said: The weapon of our policy is U.S. military power. It presupposes a number of different variations: sale of arms, use of military advisers, military training, and as a last resort, direct U.S. military actions, as in Grenada. As you see, this conception envisions a whole range of forms of armed interference in other people's affairs, and various forms of attack, but there is not a word in it about defense. And this is a foreign policy concept -- in other words, a concept designed at the State Department.

What, then, is one to say about the doctrines that are engendered in the Pentagon?

[Bogdanov] We know a certain amount about those doctrines; we know the tendency of those doctrines. You are quite right that the word defense is totally absent from those documents. Moreover, in 1953, one of the U.S. congressional committees made a special decision not to give a farthing for Pentagon research concerned with ending war or defensive measures. And that is still in force. But that is only one aspect of the matter. There is another side to it. We can not exclude the possibility that even in the American ruling class itself -- it is very broad -- there are reasonable elements there are elements that we call realistic. Look what is happening in the U.S. Congress, which has really become quite active in opposing the mad program of militarization, which is trying to erect barriers of some sort to the Reagan administration's headlong arms race.

In the United States, too, there are forces which reason in new terms, in terms of the reality of the nuclear space era, and it may be that this is a source of hope for the future.

[Beglov] I would like to confirm what you have said with an illustration. On Thursday the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate examined a draft resolution calling on the President to review his approach to the SALT II treaty and return to a position of fulfilling the treaty's conditions; the co-authors of this resolution -- which, incidentally, was adopted with a majority of 29 to 11 -- were Democratic Senator Joseph Biden and Republican Senator William Cohen. Moreover, when the draft was being presented for debate, one of the co-authors, Senator Joseph Biden, stated directly what they were alarmed at -- at the fact that control of U.S. arms control policy has fallen into the hands of a small group of right-wing advisers who, for a number of years now, have been striving to destroy the entire arms control structure.

Well here, obviously, the U.S. President too is faced with a dilemma. Who is he in the eyes of the world, in the eyes of his partners and in the eyes of the Soviet Union -- Reagan the peacemaker or Reagan the destroyer of arms control treaties?

[Tsvetov] The appeal by the Warsaw Pact participant-states gives Western Europe the opportunity to become Europe, a peaceful Europe and a secure Europe. It seems to me that the countries of Western Europe, above all the NATO members, should seize the proposals put forward at Budapest. All the more so since the plan proposed by the Warsaw Pact participant-states not only does not rule out the most direct participation of the United States in discussing these proposals, but foresees such participation. That is, there is no question of any attempts to split the Western alliance, if indeed this alliance is so dear to the countries of Western Europe.

[Bogdanov] This is what is meant by the concept of common security -- the security of the Soviet Union, the United States, and Western Europe in a single package, so to speak. Now it only remains for us to wait a little and see how those who determine the policies of Western Europe and the United States -- those belonging to what we call the ruling classes -- will react to these very specific, businesslike, and far-reaching Soviet proposals. I would very much like to hope that the voice of reason and realism will prevail over anti-Soviet and anticomunist feelings.

[Tsvetov] In Budapest there was discussion of another issue, a very important issue relating not only to European security but to worldwide security. The participants in the conference again brought up the question of ending all nuclear tests. It was pointed out that the ending of all nuclear tests would be the first and a quite feasible step toward nuclear disarmament. Whatever we and those who might agree with our program may try to do in Europe -- whatever we may try to do together, all these efforts will be largely in vain if the nuclear arms race is not stopped.

[Bogdanov] Unfortunately, there has still not been a positive reaction to the Soviet proposals by the American side. The explosions in Nevada rumble on uninterrupted. Today, he who genuinely does not want to have nuclear weapons ceases testing, for the ceasing of testing is the beginning of the end of nuclear weapons. He who in words states that he is against nuclear weapons but in practice engages in their development, engages in the creation of more and more new types and seeks sources -- nuclear sources -- for an antimissile defense system, he continues testing in spite of everything and contrary to the interests of his own people.

[Beglov] Concern over the continuation of U.S. nuclear tests is growing throughout the world, not only in connection with the fact that behind it lies the development of nuclear arsenals, but also because the U.S. leadership is urging on and forcing the program of creation of space strike weapons. Meanwhile, most scientific workers doubt the expediency of SDI and in addition the impression is now forming that instead of reducing nuclear arsenals a real antimissile defense system might require additional nuclear weapons. And this is shown by the explosions in Nevada. Additional nuclear explosions and additional nuclear weapons -- there is your U.S. Administration, its true aspirations, and its true program.

[Tsvetov] And in order to hamper the ceasing of all nuclear tests, in order to hamper this process, the United States is again bringing up the problem of monitoring. I would like to mention here that there are now virtually no seismologists in the United States who consider the national means for detecting underground nuclear tests to be inadequate. Moreover, U.S. military specialists themselves confirm that American so-called close observation satellites are capable of distinguishing objects on the earth's surface as small as 10 centimeters in size.

If these monitoring measures are not enough for the United States, the Soviet Union is willing to discuss any other forms of monitoring at all and itself proposes forms of monitoring. Here one cannot fail to recall the words of the late Olof Palme, who said that monitoring stations cost far less than new missiles -- and I would add here: and nuclear warheads as well.

For this reason the communique of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee again emphasizes that the Soviet Union is willing to discuss and accept the widest range of forms of monitoring the implementation of an accord on ending nuclear tests.

[Bogdanov] Thus, we can again with absolute certainty repeat that given goodwill, given genuine desire to put an end to the nuclear arms race, and to find ways of ending the conventional arms race and limiting them, there is only one thing lacking -- goodwill; all the other components are there.

[Tavetov] The content of both the conference communique and the appeal by the Warsaw Pact member-states is astonishingly broad. There will still be a great deal of discussion -- very detailed discussion -- of these documents and they will certainly influence the development of international politics for a long time to come. And we shall return to these two documents frequently. For the moment, in concluding our round table conversation, I would like to recall that in the first international forum to which the Soviet Union gained access -- the Genoa Conference -- the Soviet delegation offered a proposal to carry out a universal reduction of arms and armies of all states and to ban barbaric forms of waging war and poison gases -- nuclear weapons did not exist then. At that time Lenin said that we promise the workers and peasants that we will do everything for peace and we shall do that, stressed Lenin. This behest of Lenin's is now being implemented by the whole socialist camp. Thank you for your attention. Goodbye!

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW: PACT PROPOSALS, GENEVA TALKS, SALT II

LD221923 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 22 Jun 86

[("International Observers Round Table" program with Vadim Borisovich Kassis, chief editor of GOLOS RODINY and OTCHIZNA, and Edward Vasilyevich Kovalev, writer on international affairs, presented by Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator)]

[Excerpts] [Andrianov] We are now coming to the end of the 2d week since the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee in Budapest, but the results of that meeting continue to rivet the attention of broad circles at international public opinion, first and foremost, of course, in Europe. The attractive force of the documents adopted in Budapest lies in the fact that they contain a clear and articulate call for peace by the socialist countries. Particular timeliness and exceptional importance are given to that call for the obvious reason that it was made during a tense situation, at one of the most acute moments in the history of mankind. So it is with new forces that there arises the problem of the responsibility of states, governments, and politicians for the future of nations and our whole planet. For the world has now entered a stage in its development when to shrink from resolving the fundamental questions of today means putting the entire destiny of civilization at risk.

[Kassis] The members of the Warsaw Pact are fully aware of their responsibility to their peoples and to mankind for the destiny of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

They are of the opinion that it is quite possible to resolve the cardinal question of our time -- that of defending peace and breaking the trend of growth in the danger of war. But what is now needed for this, more than ever before, is decisive action aimed at ending the arms race and switching to real disarmament. Readiness to act in this direction was yet again shown vividly and convincingly by the socialist countries that signed the final documents of the Budapest conference. Moreover, the world press makes note of the fact that a direct appeal was issued by the Warsaw Pact member-states to the NATO member-states and all European countries proposing a program for a large-scale reduction in armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe.

[Andrianov] The problem of such a reduction is most directly related to the question of ending the arms race, lowering the level of nuclear confrontation and, in the final analysis, eliminating the threat of nuclear war. Suffice it to recall the counterarguments, if they can be called that, which were cited by the opponents of detente in an attempt to prove that it is impossible to halt the present dangerous course of events. In rejecting the Soviet proposals to start reducing the stock of nuclear weapons and then liquidate them completely, the NATO bosses referred, among other things, to the fact that these weapons of mass annihilation, so they said, guarantee the security of the West, since, they continued, the Warsaw Pact countries are considerably superior to NATO in the sphere of conventional weapons. Under these conditions, they asserted, the West cannot abandon its nuclear forces of restraint, for if it were to do so, they said, the balance of power would be upset and the East would immediately take advantage of this to unleash aggression. Counting on giving plausibility to such arguments, the NATO propaganda rang the alarm about avalanches of Soviet tanks which were ready at any moment, they said, to sweep over Western Europe, and painted a picture of all kinds of horrors about a potential invasion from the East, trying to frighten all the West Europeans with the idea of a universal communist takeover. Of course, sensible realized what lay behind such far-fetched arguments, for Soviet representatives have on numerous occasions given specific figures which show that an approximate parity in armed forces and arms exists between the two military alliances in Europe. Then the NATO side resorted to another time-worn argument in order to brush aside the proposals for a reduction in conventional weapons which our country and its allies submitted. The West made unsubstantiated assertions that the Soviet Union rejects a reliable system of monitoring the reductions, although its is generally known that the Soviet leadership has stated on numerous occasions that the Soviet Union advocates strict international monitoring, on conditions, of course, of reciprocity.

[Kovalev] Yet another crushing blow has now been dealt the fabrications of Western propaganda. Since the proposals made at the Budapest conference, all the arguments by the NATO bosses have clearly been losing their foundation. That is quite evident. It turns out that things are now up to the West. Indisputably, the path leading to the demilitarization of Europe, to a Europe without wars, is extremely complex and difficult. The military staffs in the West are too accustomed to thinking only in categories of confrontation: There is no way that they can get rid of their fixed illusions of acquiring military superiority in order to dictate their conditions from a position of strength to the other side. Certain Western figures stubbornly persist in looking at the realities of the world today from the position of the past. This undoubtedly fetters the political will of certain governments. But such a will must be shown, and it must triumph over disagreement, for there is simply no other way out: Otherwise the prospects for Europe, and together with Europe the whole world, look bad.

[Kassis] The June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, through the speech by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed yet again that the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries are fully resolved to develop actively their consistent and constructive course of consolidating peace and international security. As the French L'HUMANITE notes, the Soviet Union is making enormous efforts to get the Soviet-U.S. talks out of deadlock. Great importance is attached to the steps by the Soviet Union to ease the search for mutually acceptable solutions to the vital questions of today by the French LE MONDE. The world press comments widely on the tenets contained in the report by Comrade Gorbachev at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, highlighting the parts that speak of the Soviet proposals aimed at curbing the arms race and preventing a nuclear catastrophe.

Comrade Gorbachev noted in his report that the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee in Budapest discussed the situation taking shape at the Geneva talks with the United States. The question has arisen of whether we should stand still and squabble with the Americans -- which suits them down to the ground -- or whether we should search for new approaches, ones that would enable the path toward reducing nuclear weapons to be cleared. Of course, the latter, and proceeding from the principle of making a practical search for a mutually acceptable solution in Geneva, we suggested to the Americans an intermediate variant. It is formulated as follows. First, agreement is reached not to depart from the ABM Treaty for at least a period of 15 years, and work in the area of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative is limited to the level of laboratory research -- in other words, to the threshold that the United States has already reached. And second, strategic offensive weapons are limited to equal levels, and in this case the question of medium-range weapons capable of reaching the other side's territory, including land-based long-range cruise missiles, is resolved separately.

This variant quite evidently demonstrates once again the desire by the Soviet Union for a mutual and acceptable accord, although of course we would prefer to come to an agreement immediately on a radical, 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

[Andrianov] And how did Washington react to this intermediate variant? What was its initial reaction?

[Kassis] Let's start with the official levels of power, so to speak. A White House representative said, with the quick reaction and the stereotyped words that are characteristic of that house, that the Soviet proposals are being studied. Something similar was repeated to journalists by Reagan himself. But the WASHINGTON POST decided to add to these customary laconic words one significant detail: Within the administration, the newspaper stresses, there is disagreement between those who want to continue the former policy and those who believe that the Soviet peace initiatives may be the basis for fruitful talks. Reports of Moscow's new peace initiatives arrived in the United States at a time when argument over the most important areas of Washington's domestic and foreign policy had become intense. The continuation by the Pentagon of nuclear tests on the Nevada test site, then Washington's veto of the SALT II treaty -- all this is giving rise to considerable concern and protests among many Americans. They are of the opinion that the Soviet Union's peace proposals indicate real ways of preventing war and real ways of consolidating international security.

It would seem that all is clear, but still there are people in Washington who continue to create smokescreens, and to read tea leaves.

They include, for example, Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, who claims that since the President considers the SALT II treaty to be a dead letter, it is difficult for us to affirm that that document binds the Russians either. And further: Maybe in spite of everything, the Russians will comply with the treaty. What then? What should we do? Rowny, special adviser to the President and secretary of state on arms control issues, is once again launching incomprehensible attacks on the SALT II treaty. He juggles deftly with formulas and terms like chimera and nuclear weapons nonequivalence, holds forth about some sort of Russian monopoly in the sphere of this and that type of missile, about a threat from the Soviets to our friends and allies in Asia and so on and so forth. However, none of it is to the point; it does not concern the essence of the problem. Most of the mass information media, commenting on the Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, stress that the Soviet Union intends to continue persistently implementing its peace initiatives, which are in line with the innermost hopes of the earth's inhabitants.

[Andrianov] Indeed our country is not ceasing its peace efforts, taking into account the fact that the international situation remains complex, and that there are as yet no grounds for talking about an easing of tension. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed this in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee plenum. In connection with this, he recalled the steps that the Soviet Union has taken to prevent the positive line leading from Geneva from disappearing and dissolving in the whirlpool of international life. Our initiatives, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said, have worked and continue to work for an improvement in the international climate.

However, as we can see, the prospects for easing tension do not suit the West, where they see such a development of events as a threat to their interests. It is in just such a perspective that representatives of the U.S. reactionary ruling group see the possibility of an easing of tension. It is no coincidence that there has recently been a whole series of rejections of Soviet proposals on the cardinal issues of contemporary development.

In addition to these rejections there has been the U.S. side's unwillingness to hold conscientious talks in Geneva and Vienna. In Bern, Washington displayed an imperial contempt for the interests of all the states of Europe, and indeed of other continents, and ruined the possibility of achieving significant accords on human rights.

[Andrianov] In assessing the causes of the current tension in international affairs one cannot fail to notice that the U.S. leaders have absolutely no desire to perceive contemporary realities; they do not want to see them as they really are. This is the only explanation for the fact that Washington is banking on naked strength. In their view, the nuclear fist should decide everything. They are placing their hopes on terrorist brigandage. All these and similar views and conceptions are thickly mixed with ideological intolerance and class hatred. At the same time they invariably repeat that they are looking after the security of their own country and of the entire world. However, their star wars plans, the arms race, and militaristic blackmail are, on the contrary, increasingly undermining the security of the entire world, including that of the United States.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev particularly stressed this point in his report at the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

It is becoming increasingly obvious, he said, that the real threat to U.S. security emanates not from external forces -- such a threat, and a considerable one too, is presented by that country's military and political elite and its adventuristic behavior in the world arena. As for the Soviet Union, its objectives are utterly clear: We are striving to develop the country's social and economic development; we advocate broad international cooperation beneficial to all; we are struggling for disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons in order to guarantee mankind stable peace.

In what way do these objectives threaten U.S. security? It turns out, however, that it is precisely the Soviet Union's peaceful aims and its peace-loving policy on the international stage which worry imperialism's ruling circles. They have seen in the Soviet initiatives a mighty obstacle to the realization of their imperial designs intended for world supremacy and social revenge.

[Kassis] In connection with this, it is maybe in order to note that today's meeting at the round table coincides with a bleak date in the history of the Soviet people and all mankind. Exactly 45 years ago on this day Nazi Germany treacherously attacked our homeland. Having unleashed the war, the Nazi leaders maintained that Germany had allegedly done it for preventive purposes. That was an insolent lie. Our country had not intended to attack anyone. There was a much simpler explanation for it all. The destruction of the Soviet Union was a long-standing dream of international imperialism. It was precisely that imperialism which directed its assault force, German Nazism, against the world's first socialist state. Everyone knows well how the just liberation war of the Soviet people ended: The darkest forces in the West that had infringed upon the freedom and independence of our homeland suffered a shattering defeat. And the present attempts by the falsifiers of history to distort the causes and results of the most bloody war are in vain. Mankind knows the true aggressors and their patrons. It suitably assesses the Soviet Union's decisive role in the utter defeat of Nazi Germany and militarist Japan.

But it is our reality which forces us to speak today of 22 June 1941. Indeed the world has changed beyond recognition over the 45 years that have elapsed since that day. Nevertheless, it has not, unfortunately, become secure in that time. Just as many years ago, under cover of words about peace, the imperialists are arming themselves. They accuse the Soviet Union of perfidious designs, calling it an evil empire. They hold international law and existing agreements of no account. And does not the present international terrorism of the United States bring to mind the brigandage committed by Nazi Germany in Europe in the thirties and forties? At times even Washington's pretexts for interference, by their artificiality and cynicism, resemble those articulated at that time.

And one more coincidence: At the basis of the present actions by the U.S. ruling circles there lies the same striving for world supremacy. It is that which in our days has engendered in U.S. doctrine of neoglobalism, a doctrine of international brigandage.

[Andrianov] That is why the main lesson of the Great Patriotic War is especially clear now: It is necessary to repulse any aggressive claims in good time and resolutely. War should be fought against before it begins. At the same time it is necessary to take into consideration that the ruling circles of imperialism, forcing a military psychosis, are hoping for an opportunity to hamper the realization of our creative plans, to impede the development of the socialist countries and to keep us in the fetters of an arms race. That is why the main objective of our foreign policy should consist in foiling these dangerous designs. Having noted this task, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev also stressed that the fate of the world cannot be left in the hands of imperialism so that the imperialist reaction could succeed in foisting upon mankind an extension of military-political confrontation.

This, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary underscored, would mean slipping toward a nuclear war.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA ON PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR COLOGNE CONGRESS

PM050754 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and Yu. Yakhontov dispatch:
"Preserving Life on Earth; Sixth International Physicians Congress Has Adopted
Important Documents"]

[Text] Cologne, 1 Jun--The sixth international congress of the international movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" ended work here today.

Representatives of practical and scientific medicine, politicians, public figures, and journalists from more than 50 countries took part in the forum. At plenary sessions and during seminars and meetings the delegates and guests--more than 3,000 people in all--discussed the most important questions linked with the highly acute need to save mankind from the specter of the "final epidemic" which would be the result of a nuclear war, were one permitted.

The work of the congress, which was held under the slogan "Preserve Life on Earth," attracted great attention from the West German and foreign public. Impassioned, sometimes pointed, but invariably well-intentioned discussions were held. The congress participants came to the unanimous conclusion that there must be no place for war on our earth. There can be no winners in a war. Hence the conclusion that it is necessary to eliminate nuclear weapons. The immediate and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests should be a decisive step along this path.

The Chernobyl accident, the forum participants said, has shown that the nuclear age requires new political thinking and new policies.

At the last plenary session the congress ratified three documents. The physicians adopted an "Appeal to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan." This states in particular: "Ensuring universal security through disarmament and the elimination of nuclear arms is the sole guarantee of peace and the preservation of life in the nuclear age."

"That is why we insistently urge the following steps to be taken:

"The United States should:

"join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions announced by the Soviet Union;

"observe the mutual moratorium until the successful completion of talks on the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty;

"and initiate forthwith and conduct without delay talks on banning tests.

"Your governments, representing two mighty countries, bear a special responsibility to mankind in banning nuclear tests—the first step on the road to eliminating nuclear weapons from military arsenals.

"In International Peace Year," the document says, "you can show that science and technology that follows it serve one goal alone: to improve life on earth and not threaten it with destruction. The tragedies of Chernobyl and the space shuttle 'Challenger' remind us of the fragility of man and any equipment, including the weapons control systems that threaten life itself."

The congress sent a message from the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" to the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Tanzania, Mexico, and Sweden, urging them to continue to advocate talks aimed at drawing up a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests.

As is well known, back in 1985 the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" issued a "prescription" for putting a stop to the greatest threat to man's health. To that end they urged that a moratorium on all nuclear explosions be announced immediately as the first step needed along the road toward turning back the nuclear arms race. Now in Cologne the congress participants have adopted a document reaffirming this prescription.

It can definitely be said that the congress has been an important landmark in the movement of physicians for the prevention of nuclear war, Academician Ye. I. Chazov, cochairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement, said at the end of the congress. We have been joined here at the congress by representatives of several more countries, which attests to the movement's growing prestige. The sessions have been held in a complex political situation. Judging by the reaction of right-wing FRG newspapers, what happened at our forum has been greeted with bitterness by the forces advocating the continuation of the arms race and the transformation of our continent into a nuclear weapons dump. It was therefore all the more important to have felt here in Cologne the broad support of progressive FRG forces and the world public. Ordinary people believe us physicians and our "prescription" for preserving life on earth.

The congress was very successful, its chairman (K. Bonkheffer) said in his turn. We had discussions, got to know each other, and learned a lot from each other. Referring to the Chernobyl accident, the enemies of our movement and skeptics forecast yet another failure for the forum and even a split among its participants. But exactly the reverse happened. We became even more cohesive, recognizing the danger hanging over the world of the use of the military atom.

I very much hope that it has become even clearer during the congress how seriously and with what sense of responsibility the physicians participating in the movement approach their duty of making a contribution to safeguarding peace. That is why I am convinced that we have taken yet another step forward at this congress. Our direct aim, which we have reaffirmed here at Cologne, is that nuclear weapons tests must be entirely stopped. The United States must immediately follow the call and example of the Soviet Union, which has announced a moratorium on nuclear tests--that is our demand, that is our prescription. One of the speakers in the hall said graphically that "It is necessary to test Moscow's proposals in practice and not test nuclear bombs." I entirely agree with him.

The delegates decided that the next, seventh, congress of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" international movement will be held next year in Moscow.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR LEADERS VISIT PRC

PM180753 Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Jun 86 p 1

[Own Correspondent S. Kuznetsov report: "Useful Meetings"]

[Text] Beijing, 10 May--The 6-day visit to Beijing by a delegation of the leadership of the international movement Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War has ended. Dr Bernard Lown, the American cardiologist, and Academician Ye. i. Chazov of the Soviet Union--the movement's co-chairmen--answered journalists' questions at Beijing's Shouda airport.

Dr Lown said:

The visit to the PRC by a delegation of the international movement's leadership was part of a global program aimed at drawing the attention of broad public circles in countries on all continents and of everyone in the world to the danger of the nuclear arms race.

We visited China at the invitation of the All-China Medical Association. We were received with kindness and attention. We met with Chinese doctors and medical students. Academician Chazov and I delivered lectures on the medical and environmental consequences of nuclear war.

The delegation was received by Wan Li, premier of the PRC State Council. There were frank conversations at the Chinese people's society for peace and disarmament, and at the Association for Promoting International Mutual Understanding and Exchanges. We acquainted our Chinese colleagues with our movement's principles and aims, which on the whole met with their understanding and approval. For that reason we regard this trip as the beginning of our cooperation with Chinese doctors.

Sharing this assessment, Academician Ye. i. Chazov noted that there had been productive and friendly meetings both in the professional, medical sphere and with prominent PRC politicians and social figures, thus demonstrating the high standing of the international physicians' movement. Contacts and exchanges of opinions with our PRC colleagues will continue. "Undoubtedly," Academician Ye.i. Chazov said in conclusion, "the participation of Chinese doctors in the movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War would make its activity even more effective in character. It is also gratifying that our Chinese colleagues expressed unanimous interest in expanding diverse contacts with Soviet doctors."

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S BOVIN VIEWS GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR CONSEQUENCES

PM181311 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[IZVESTIYA Political Observer A. Bovin article: "There Is No Other Way..."]

[Text] The emergence and accumulation of nuclear weapons, which possess a vast, unthinkable destructive force, was received by many as a real threat to mankind's existence. But there were many others too. Yes, they said, the destruction will be tremendous and hundreds of millions will die but that does not mean that all mankind will perish. Especially since according to all the possible scenarios, a nuclear war will be localized to the Northern Hemisphere "alone"... That is how the nuclear optimists reasoned.

The eighties introduced fundamentally new elements into the debate on the consequences of nuclear war. In early 1983, Soviet and American scientists, acting independently of each other, reached the following conclusion: The use of nuclear weapons will lead to an acute change in the earth's climate and cause a global ecological disaster. This conclusion was published in Washington at an international conference "The World Against Nuclear War" held there (31 October- 1 November 1983). Thus the concepts of the "nuclear night" and "nuclear winter" entered our lives.

What does this mean? Calculations show that as a result of nuclear explosions there will be gigantic mass conflagrations that will be accompanied by the release into the atmosphere of a vast quantity (hundreds of million of tons) of combustion products -- soot, ash, and toxic gases. Black clouds will cover the sun and swallow up the sunlight, which will cause the "nuclear night" -- a darkening of the earth's surface.

The disruption of the planet's radiation balance will lead to a fall in temperature on its surface of approximately 15-20 degrees. As a result of the radical restructuring of the circulation system in the atmosphere, this unprecedented climatic disaster will spread, in a few weeks, over the entire globe, which will entail the mass destruction of the earth's flora and fauna.

It is obvious that the geophysical consequences of a nuclear war would be considerably more powerful than the direct effects of nuclear weapons. After a nuclear war, Academician Ye. P. Velikhov writes, "the people who survive the first strike will be in conditions of cruel cold, without drinking water, food, or fuel, under the effects of powerful radiation, in conditions of extreme psychological stress and raging epidemics; and all this will be happening in twilight or darkness. That is why, in practice, a nuclear war on any scale will mean either the disappearance of the human race or its degradation to a level lower than that of prehistory." This same idea was expressed more laconically by U.S. Senator E. Kennedy. A nuclear conflict, he said, "would pose just one question: Not how many people would survive a nuclear strike, but how long would be the hour of their dying on a dying planet." It is terrifying to read such words, but we must have the courage to look into the abyss... It should be borne in mind that the total yield of nuclear explosions after which irreversible catastrophic changes to the earth's climate and biosphere will begin is very small -- of the order of 100 megatons.

That is approximately 150 times less than the entire megatonnage that has now been stockpiled.

A significant aspect of modern ideas about the long-term consequences of nuclear war lies in their independence of the geography of nuclear explosions. "Calculations show," says the conclusion document of the International Conference of Scientists organized by the Papal Academy of Sciences in the Vatican (January 1984), "that the dust and smoke will spread to the tropics and the greater part of the Southern Hemisphere. Thus even the nonbelligerent countries, including those far from the region of the conflict, will experience its terrible effects. India, Brazil, Nigeria, or Indonesia could be destroyed as a result of nuclear war even though not a single warhead exploded on their territory..."

One effect of the "nuclear winter" was expressed in a more paradoxical form by Prof C. Sagan of Cornell University: "Even if a nuclear state plans in detail and carries out a first nuclear strike, theoretically excluding all technical possibility for the enemy to inflict a retaliatory strike, even in that event it will in effect be committing suicide."

A special topic is the psychological consequences of nuclear war. They are horrifying. "It is possible that after a nuclear conflict some people will remain alive," argues Academician N.P. Bekhtereva, a well known expert in neurophysiology. "But at the same time, after a nuclear catastrophe it is absolutely certain that neither the social structure nor the system of vital supplies and health care will survive. And then, when all moral values are lost, when no help will be given to the sick and dying -- the world will be a very terrible place.

As a professional, as a specialist in this sphere of science, I can say: The human brain will not withstand this horror, it will cease to serve man as it serves him now." The prediction -- especially for the Third World -- is for mass panic, the collapse of social life, the crumbling of all the established foundations of power, and the transformation of cities into centers of plunder, disorder, chaos, and epidemics.

The materials quoted above are taken from the book "Climatic and Biological Consequences of Nuclear War" [Klimaticheskiye i Biologicheskiye Posledstviya Yadernoy Voyny], just published by the Nauka Publishing House. The book was prepared by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against The Nuclear Threat and published with the help of the Soviet Peace Foundation. The chief editor is Academician Ye.P. Velikhov. The content of the book includes the latest scientific data about the "nuclear night" and "nuclear winter," about the global consequences of nuclear explosions.

I foresee the question: Is there any need to "frighten" people, is there any need to publish such books? In my opinion, "frighten" is not the correct word. It is necessary to tell people the truth, to warn them, to make sure people understand what is happening and what could happen. "... The time has come," M.S. Gorbachev said at the 27th CPSU Congress, "To fully understand the harsh realities of our day: Nuclear weapons contain within themselves a tornado capable of sweeping the human race off the face of the earth."

In a nuclear war, Soviet scientists state, "there are no effective means of protection, and it is particularly impossible to create any." Since this is the case, the only correct, only reasonable, only responsible policy is the policy of preventing nuclear war. The policy that our country persistently and consistently pursue is to prevent war -- there is no other way.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW PATRIARCH WRITES LETTER TO REAGAN ON NUCLEAR ARMS

PM161205 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Patriarch Pimen: "Open Letter to Mr Ronald Reagan, U.S. President"]

[Text] Your Excellency, Esteemed Mr President!

The members of the Russian Orthodox Church and all the Soviet Union's Christians recognize with particular acuteness the scope of the responsibility of religious people in our time for the preservation of the sacred gift of life from a nuclear catastrophe.

Christ made peace through the blood of his cross, reconciling all things unto himself, be they in earth or in heaven (Colossians 1: 20), to make in himself a new man by making peace (Ephesians 2: 15). He gave Christians a divine name -- peacemakers on earth (Matthew 5: 9). In striving for this, we have in our hearts a sacred desire that we never cease to pray for, that a Christian, all-embracing peace, which is the fullness of peace among people, increasingly determine relations among all people so that these relations would be built on the principles of fraternity and justice.

Sacred writ attests that man is responsible to God for the state of creation, which the Creator entrusted to his zealous charge: to dress it and keep it (Genesis 2:15). This realization has now been exacerbated by the fact that it has become clear in recent decades how unpredictably destructive the forces man now strives to direct and use can be.

Scientists in both our countries have convincingly shown that in the event of a nuclear conflict even a small number of nuclear explosions would be capable of so radically altering the climate and living conditions on earth that it would inevitably entail the death of mankind and all life. This leads us to ponder the particular danger of doctrines used in international relations such as "nuclear intimidation [ustrasheniye]," "nuclear deterrence," and "preventive nuclear strike" since they justify and lead to increases in and improvements to nuclear weapons, corrode the moral foundations of international relations, and increase the likelihood of the accidental outbreak of a nuclear conflict. We are convinced that the desire for nuclear superiority that underpins these doctrines is not a means of ensuring security for those countries that adhere to it. Nuclear weapons can be compared to a boomerang that inevitably returns to he who throws it.

We also know that the production and even the stockpiling of nuclear weapons poses a great danger since they could lead to unforeseen and tragic consequences. Hence the universally widespread and entirely justifiable conviction that life on our planet can only be preserved if nuclear weapons are removed entirely from the face of the earth. From our religious viewpoint any step or effort in this direction is blessed and in accordance with the will of God.

That is why we ardently welcome the efforts of those politicians who persistently strive to rid the earth of the pollution of nuclear weapons, to keep the firmament intact, and to create a new moral atmosphere within nations and among states, an atmosphere in which, we are convinced, it will be possible to peacefully resolve all international problems and ensure genuine fraternal cooperation among all people in order to achieve the cherished goal of creating for all people a crown of creation and a way of life worthy of mankind.

In this connection we welcome the decision of our country's government to introduce a moratorium on all nuclear tests -- a moratorium that has been in force for 10 months now and, to our regret, still remains unilateral despite the fact that nuclear explosions pave the way for the creation of the increasingly sophisticated weapons that even you, Mr President, consider a threat to mankind.

We have been struck by the fact that the moratorium, which is a courageous step by the Soviet side, has been answered by nuclear explosions at the Nevada test site. How can this be in accordance with your devotion to the teachings of Our Lord and Savior on the love of God and man and the assertion of peace on earth, which you never stop talking about.

Nor do we understand the reasons for the absence of a positive response on your part to the Soviet proposal to develop and adopt an international treaty banning weapons tests with the establishment of the proper mutually acceptable verification [kontrol] of its execution.

Equally inexplicable is the absence of a positive response from you to the proposal put forward by Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev for an immediate meeting with you in order to come to an agreement on this vitally important question. "Seek peace and pursue it," says the prophet and psalmist David (33: 15) and the leaders of states, who bear the greatest responsibility for the people's fate, must create with the utmost boldness, consistency, courage, and goodwill the long-awaited peace among people and manifest on earth God's peace, of which the holy apostle Paul said that it "passeth all understanding and shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus" (Philippians 4: 7).

We wholeheartedly welcome the scientifically substantiated large-scale program for phased reductions in nuclear weapons leading to their complete elimination by the end of this century, which has also been proposed by our state.

This program is "imbued with high moral purport and aimed at creating a new moral climate in international relations and new political thinking including an acute awareness on the part of responsible statesmen for the fate of peace, for the establishment and strengthening of trust in relations among people and states, and for the surmounting of the stereotypes of enmity and confrontation among countries with different social systems." ("Russian Orthodox Church Holy Synod Message on War and Peace in the Nuclear Age" 2.37).

We profoundly regret that this proposal has still not received a worthy assessment and support from your side or a sensible counterproposal.

The latter circumstance is all the more depressing because you clearly cannot but agree that the resolution of the nuclear disarmament problem will decide whether we greet the 2000th anniversary of Our Lord Jesus Christ's arrival in the world on a prosperous earth reflecting God's glory or whether it will be a scorched and lifeless desert!

The proposals to which I refer include plans for the elimination of chemical weapons -- those barbaric weapons of mass destruction. This proposal has also not yet received a positive response from you. Moreover, it is well known that production of a type of chemical weapon -- binary weapons -- has been sanctioned in your country.

It is not rhetoric if we exclaim: Just where, Mr President, is the limit of this thirst for arms?! What means are capable of stopping this insane movement toward the triumph of death?! How could that loss of love for one's kith and kin -- meaning everyone for us Christians -- without which, according to the apostle Paul (I Corinthians 13), all other spiritual gifts are as nothing, have come about?!

We recall last November's summit. U.S. and Soviet Christians prayed hard for it directly in Geneva. Many Christians and followers of other religions all around the world prayed for its success. The summit brought forth the hope that there could be a world without nuclear weapons, a world in which the needs of hundreds of millions of people struggling to survive and thirsting for justice would be satisfied.

We are not relinquishing that hope and call on you to preserve the "spirit of Geneva" and follow the accords that were reached there, accords on whose implementation the future not only of our two countries but of all mankind depends.

May your leadership genuinely promote the achievement of relations of friendship and peaceful cooperation between our great powers for the good of the world's people.

[Signed] Respectfully,

Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET BOOK ON ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL WAR

Moscow OBSCHESTVENNYYE NAUKI V SSSR: SERIYA 1--PROBLEMY NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 40-46

[Review by D.N. Lyalikov of book "Ekologicheskiye posledstviya gonki vooruzheniy" [The Ecological Effects of the Arms Race], Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, Moscow, 1984, 176 pages]

[Text] This book, which consists of an introduction, seven chapters and a conclusion, considers the effects of war upon the natural environment in the situation of the revolution in military technology and discusses the USSR's struggle for a ban on ecological warfare.

The first chapter, "The Robbed Planet," describes the negative ecological effects of the arms race, particularly the waste of limited natural resources. Throughout the 20th Century military industry has been switching to the use of increasingly rare and expensive types of raw materials. The production of nuclear weapons, missiles, nuclear-powered submarines and electronic equipment has required unprecedented amounts of uranium, plutonium, beryllium, cobalt, molybdenum, silver, platinum and so forth. Modern military aircraft are made of 20-25 percent titanium. Reserves of these ores are rapidly approaching exhaustion, however. Land is an extremely important limited resource, and because of expanding military activities the amount of land suitable for habitation is being slowly but steadily reduced. Norwegian Ecologist M. Lumsden has calculated that the 13 developed states set aside from 0.3 to 3 percent of their territory for military needs and that the average is 1.5 hectares of land for every serviceman (p 22). The standard amount of territory required for exercises by an armored division of the U.S. Army is 23,500 hectares, while ranges on the order of 230,000 hectares are required for exercises involving the use of air-to-air missiles (p 23). Even greater areas are required for testing weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons. Military bases, nuclear weapon and ammunition depots and so forth occupy enormous areas. There is a new trend toward increased use of land resources by the armed forces of the developed states, primarily in an attempt to enhance the invulnerability of missiles by making them mobile.

The second chapter, "The Environment for Habitation--A Training Ground for War and 'Regular' Military Activities," states that as a rule it was not the direct objective of a war in the past to damage the environment, although this was sometimes a very perceptible effect of military operations. During World War II the

Hitlerites engaged in large-scale destruction of crops and forests in the USSR, Poland, Norway and other nations, and destroyed dykes in Holland. When the Allies bombed Hamburg and Dresden they attempted to create fire storms. In peace-time as well the products of military enterprises, which are in the final analysis designed to damage the biosphere, are particularly anti-ecological. The testing of military equipment causes great harm to the natural environment. National and international ecological control standards do not apply to the armed forces (to warships, for example). Over the past 30 years there have been more than 125 serious accidents with American bombers and missiles involving the likelihood of a nuclear explosion. A B-52 bomber crashed near the Spanish city of Palomares in 1966, for example. Four nuclear bombs were lost, two of which were destroyed. The USA hauled away 1,500 tons of contaminated soil to a radioactive waste burial ground (p 37).

Nuclear weapons have poisoned the land, the air and ground water. More than 300 nuclear-powered submarines are a potential source of radioactive contamination of the World Ocean today. The problem of disposing of radioactive waste continues to be an urgent one. It arose back in 1942 when the atomic bomb was created, but prior to 1957 not a single ounce of this waste had been reliably buried by modern standards. Thousands of satellites, as well as the final stages of missiles, fragments and parts of structural elements, circle the Earth today. The long-term ecological effects of the rapidly expanding programs are still not known. Potentially, any satellite is capable of causing ecological damage if it explodes when being placed into orbit, while in orbit or during its return to Earth.

The title of the third chapter is "Weapons of Mass Destruction and Nature." As a rule, weapons of mass destruction operate on a nonselective basis. There is little control over the effects of their use, and these are frequently unpredictable. This is true of bacteriological weapons, and the environmental effects of their large-scale employment cannot be predicted. The introduction of microorganisms and viruses, particularly in hot and humid regions, can result in their establishment in the local ecosystem and the appearance of permanent sources of illness. Microorganisms which are pathogenic to plants are capable of destroying basic agricultural crops. Chemical weapons were extensively employed for the first time in World War I, when more than 1 million soldiers were poisoned with them, 100,000 of whom died. In addition to massive human deaths, the use of modern military chemical agents can have irreversible effects upon the environment, although their long-term influence upon nature is still poorly understood. The destruction of chemical weapons is a very expensive process, more expensive than their production, and their leakage during storage or transportation is equally dangerous.

The danger that radiological weapons will appear has arisen in recent years--in other words, the emission of radioactive substances (a powder made of waste from nuclear power plants or of radioactive isotopes, for example) for military purposes. Radio-controlled aircraft and missiles could be used for delivering and dispersing them. Although there is no indication that any state is developing or stockpiling such weapons, the need to close off this source of the arms race is acknowledged almost universally. A draft international treaty was worked out after 2 years of talks between the USSR and the USA and was turned over to

the Geneva Disarmament Committee in 1979 for subsequent discussion. Massive radioactive contamination of an area could also occur in the case of a failure of or the deliberate destruction of a nuclear reactor. We were reminded of this possibility by the Israeli air attack on a reactor under construction in Iraq in 1981.

The fourth chapter, "Nuclear War, the Final Ecological Catastrophe," states that should a nuclear war occur, it would be a real ecological catastrophe, most likely the last in the history of the Earth. Our planet could continue orbiting the Sun for billions of years, but without oxygen in its atmosphere, without plant life and without man. Nuclear weapons have a multifactor effect, and this is primarily what distinguished them from other types of weapons of mass destruction. Furthermore, the present state of scientific knowledge is such that far from all the factors are known, especially since the predicted effects of a nuclear war [do not] lend themselves to reliable quantitative description. The factors in a nuclear explosion directly affecting people (as well as the flora and fauna) are the shock wave, heat emissions and radiation (initial and residual). Gamma radiation from ground contaminated by radioactive fallout is the main distant effect of a nuclear explosion. The fact is that during an explosion at a low level the fireball, upon coming into contact with the Earth's surface, lifts up thousands of tons of soil, which is vaporized by the super-high temperature and then falls to the ground in the form of radioactive particles. We now have adequate information indicating that a nuclear war will have extremely serious consequences also for the flora and fauna. Experiments conducted with animals have shown that fatal doses for mammals range from a few hundred to 1,050 rads. The fate of fish is not entirely clear, since water provides protection from radiation. Radioactive fallout will be washed into bodies of water, however. A fatal dose for evergreen plants is no higher than for mammals, but for deciduous species it ranges from 2,000 to 8,000 rads. Grasses will suffer less, withstanding doses of 6,000 to 33,000 rads. Only 2,000-3,000 rads is enough to destroy cultivated plants. Insects have a high level of resistance to radiation (from 2,000 to 100,000 rads), as do bacteria, fungi and lichens, which can survive and even multiply in fantastic quantities. This is particularly true of the voracious plant-eating insects, and their rapid multiplication will also be aided by the elimination of their enemies, the birds. The destruction of plant life will be followed by deterioration of the soil and rapid development of erosion. It would be difficult to say what path the evolution of the remaining living matter would take. Highly virulent mutant microorganisms might appear. Recently, the scientists have been particularly concerned about the destruction of the atmosphere's protective ozone layer at an altitude of 20-30 kilometers from the effects of nitrogen oxyls, of which 5,000 tons are formed for each megaton of force in an explosion (p 79). This causes the temperature to fall and leads to drastic effects from ultraviolet radiation from the Sun. Saturation of the upper layers of the atmosphere with dust will also contribute to a cooling of the Earth's surface ("nuclear winter").

The fifth chapter, "Militarism on the Path to Ecological Weapons," stresses the fact that although the creation of fires and floods, the destruction of crops and so forth have been used for hundreds of years, "only during the second half of the 20th Century has the destruction of nature become a part of military technology and even military strategy. This has meant that it is possible to engage in ecological war--that is, the deliberate affecting of the environment for purposes of harming the enemy" (p 97). The use of ecological weapons was initiated

by the USA in the war in Indochina, which became a testing ground for various military innovations. It is not necessary to conduct ecological warfare in pure form, but that is what is involved when the environment is the main target of attack. It is already possible to effect a number of modifications in natural processes (alteration of the weather and the climate, destruction of plant life, thawing of permafrost, triggering of avalanches and landslides, and so forth), while others (alteration of ocean currents, generation of artificial earthquakes and creation of tsunamis) are at least theoretically possible. Nuclear weapons can be used for activating certain natural processes (tsunamis and earthquakes), functioning merely as the triggering mechanism. Ecological weapons are also dangerous in that they help to erase the boundaries between conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

Chapter 6, "Destruction of the Natural Environment in Indochina: An American 'Experiment' in Ecological Warfare," deals with the use of ecological weapons in Indochina by the USA. Although the war was fought with conventional weapons, it stood out sharply from all the postwar armed conflicts. The destruction it produced can be compared with the effects of weapons of mass destruction. The scale of the ecological war in Indochina is startling. A total of 21 million bombs were dropped and 229 million projectiles totaling 15 million tons were fired there, which is three times the number of bombs and projectiles released on all the fronts of World War II. More than 80 million liters of various chemicals were dispersed over Vietnam (p 115). Another feature of that ecological war was the fact that it was conducted in secret, and basic information on it was not revealed to the world community until 1974. "Weather war" operations were conducted from 1967 to 1972. Most of them were conducted in Laos with the objective of obliterating the "Ho Chi Minh Trail." Operation "Ranch Hand" was essentially chemical warfare involving the use of herbicides (which the USA regarded as "peaceful" means not subject to the ban contained in the Geneva Protocol of 1925). A total of 44 percent of all the forests in South Vietnam alone were treated with defoliants for purposes of totally destroying plant life. Blanket bombing was carried out on 26 percent of South Vietnam's territory. Such bombing methods approach the use of nuclear weapons (without the radiation). Under the "Roman Plough" program heavy bulldozers with special blades were used for removing practically every kind of woods. When the plant life was reduced the soil was subjected to erosion or hardened almost to stone and became overgrown with useless elephant grass. The ecological war left unhealing wounds in Vietnam. Its effects are still being felt, since 2 million people were affected by chemicals, the genetic transmission systems of hundreds of thousands were damaged, the composition of the blood was altered, and so forth.

The draft Convention Banning the Affecting of the Environment for Military Purposes was submitted at the UN by the Soviet Union in 1974 (the title of Chapter 7 is "An Alternative to Ecological Militarism: The Banning of Military Action on the Environment"). Bilateral talks between the USSR and the USA were conducted on this subject in 1975 and '76. An acute and complicated struggle developed around the convention, which ended with its passage by a majority of 96 votes in the General Assembly in 1976. The convention took effect in October of 1978 and had been signed by more than 60 states by the beginning of 1984.

COPYRIGHT: INION AN SSSR

11499

CSO: 5200/1347

RELATED ISSUES

TASS MARKS ANNIVERSARY OF NUCLEAR WAR PREVENTION AGREEMENT

LD200800 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 20 TASS — By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko

Thirteen years ago, on June 22, 1973, the Soviet Union and the United States signed a document of major importance -- for themselves and for the world at large. That document was the agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the prevention of nuclear war.

The sides agreed to refrain from use or threat of force against each other and against other countries in the circumstances that might put in jeopardy international peace and security.

The sides agreed that they would be guided by these considerations in shaping their foreign policy and in practical actions in the world arena.

Is this agreement remembered in Washington's "corridors of power"? Does the U.S. regard it as still operating? The attempts to find that out have failed.

The White House referred to the Department of State. The Department of State referred to various sections within the department, and one of the officials promised to give a call, but he did not. So, no answer was forthcoming.

That hasn't come as a surprise, actually. Washington has been busy in recent years with other problems -- the elaboration of and attempts to carry out the doctrines and concepts that in no way correspond to the agreement in question.

Acting within their framework, the U.S. resorted not only to threat of force with regard to other countries, but also to its direct use against Grenada, Lebanon and Libya, and undertook such actions in the field of international relations as the deployment of new American nuclear weapons in direct proximity to the borders of the Soviet Union, launched an undeclared war on Nicaragua and Afghanistan, and proclaimed nearly the entire world as the zone of its "vital interests."

To "defend" these interests, the U. S. interference wherever developments do not follow the American scenario, took shape and was adopted as guide for action under the present administration. In justifying such actions, the Department of Defense is busy churning out ever new "theoretical grounds" for American armed interference in the affairs of other countries and regions.

Among them are the concept of "low-intensity conflicts" which, allegedly, do not threaten to grow into greater armed clashes, and the concept of "vertical" and "horizontal" controllable escalation of American military interference.

According to American experts, all this is none other than an attempt to blend into a single whole the not always predictable developments in individual regions, depending on many circumstances and factors, and put this "single whole" into the overall context of Soviet-American relations.

H. Roderick, an American physicist and well-known authority on problems of preventing nuclear conflict, says that such actions may bring about a global conflict.

Another authority, Professor A. Cohen of Harvard University, investigating U.S. interference in the so-called "little wars" comes to the definite conclusion that, in following the Pentagon's concepts, the U.S. will inevitably expand even local conflicts should it become directly "involved."

There are also such directions in U. S. policy as the unchecked buildup of strategic armaments, for the sake of which Washington refused to observe the SALT-2 treaty, and its plans to deploy systems of space arms.

This course is enhancing to a dangerous extent the risk of nuclear war -- either through premeditated actions, political miscalculation or technical error.

U.S. policy, directed at masterminding a "test of strength" with the Soviet Union and other countries and peoples, is posing ever more dangerous problems for the entire world, and for the U.S. itself.

It is high time that those inhabiting the Washington "corridors of power" take out of the archives the Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of nuclear war and thoroughly study its text. For it was signed also by a President of the United States.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S TROFIMENKO OUTLINES DANGERS OF 'MILITARY ATOM'

PM171816 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 21, 2 Jun 86 pp 7-9

[Prof Genrikh Trofimenko article: "Another Alarm Signal"]

[Text] The accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station clearly demonstrated to the world how awesome a force nuclear energy can be if it gets out of control. In his television address on May 14 CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that what happened in Chernobyl was "another alarm signal, another grim warning that the nuclear age calls for new political thinking and a new policy." The energy of the atom was first put to military use when the United States bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki 41 years ago. By the beginning of the eighties the atom bombings of the two Japanese cities had taken a toll of more than 210,000 lives. The Japanese have not forgotten this, and anyone who has visited one of the cities has surely seen thousands of schoolchildren gathered at memorials to the victims of the bombings: The memory of these tragedies that defy description is passed on from generation to generation. In other countries the situation is different. Most people everywhere have of course heard of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and in many countries there are powerful anti-nuclear movements and Green Parties concerned with environmental protection and opposed even to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Nevertheless, with the passage of years awareness of the nuclear threat is dulled. Numerous atomic power stations are now in operation; in some countries, France and Sweden, for instance, they generate half the electricity consumed. Nuclear missiles stand in readiness on launching pads, but despite all the talk about the "fragility" of the nuclear balance, none of them have launched out on their planned trajectories by "accident." Does that mean there is no cause for worry? Articles by concerned scientists warning against the growing danger are often written for other scientists: the uninitiated has no easy time making his way through the jungle of formulas and complex calculations proving the inevitability of the "nuclear winter" if a global nuclear war of even "average" intensity were to break out. Only the alarm signals that sound from time to time sharpen people's sense of impending danger and put wide sections of the world public on their guard. These alarm signals are the major nuclear incidents: there were Palomares in Spain, where an American strategic bomber dropped nuclear bombs (which, true, did not explode, but merely cracked, subjecting a large area to radioactive contamination), the explosion of a U.S. strategic Titan missile in its silo, the release of radioactive substance at the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant in the United States, and scores of other dangerous incidents involving both atoms for peace and atoms for war. Now there is Chernobyl. There is a diabolical irony in the reaction of some Western mass media and politicians to this incident. Chernobyl was not presented simply as a grave mishap, it was exaggerated to gargantuan dimensions, and this despite the fact that it was not a nuclear blast, but an explosion of gas resulting in a discharge of radioactive particles. Who capitalized on it and why was explained in detail by Mikhail Gorbachev in his television address.

It is in place to ask: if an accident at one nuclear reactor, moreover one not involving a nuclear explosion, is described in the West as nothing short of a global catastrophe, how are we to regard the so-called "limited nuclear wars," "surgical" nuclear strikes, and "counterforce nuclear attacks" which Western politicians, with the assistance of the mass media, have for years presented as admissible, almost innocent actions? All manner of anti-Sovietists maintain that Chernobyl was an incredible catastrophe from which it would take the world a long time to recover. This contention is advanced by the very same quarters that for years assured the public that in the event of a "strategic counterforce attack" on a country the size of the U.S. involving simultaneous hits on military installations by over 2,000 one-megaton nuclear warheads "most urban industrial systems... would experience little or no economic effects," while the total number of injured "both from direct effects and fall-out" would be "less than half of the total annual peacetime occurrence of non-fatal injuries in the U.S.A."

(This comes from a "reassuring" Pentagon estimate of the effects of "limited" nuclear war prepared for the U.S. Congress.) Moreover, for years the well-known American physicist Eugene Wigner argued that even if the U.S.S.R., in the event of an American nuclear attack on it, were to retaliate with a full scale strike not at military installations, but at American cities and industrial centres, the most elementary precautions could ensure the survival of 95 percent of the U.S. population. But now Western experts hold that non-nuclear damage to one power reactor in the centre of Europe threatens the whole world with unpredictable consequences. What is the truth? The truth is that if a single nuclear reactor that gets out of hand presents a formidable threat, even a "super-limited" nuclear war (comparable for yield of the warheads used to the simultaneous destruction, as a result of nuclear reaction getting out of control, of all the atomic power plants now in operation in the world) would mean nothing less than the end of civilization. Thus, the scenarios for "safe" counterforce nuclear wars in vogue in the West are sheer deception, a fiction concocted by the militarist to mislead the public. All such "reassuring scenarios," under cover of which the hawks in the U.S. Congress and the parliaments of a number of other NATO countries have been putting through ever bigger military budgets, should be consigned to the scrap heap. There can be no safe nuclear war! More, not only nuclear, but also conventional war is inadmissible in the present conditions. Today both experts and laymen know full well that the destruction of even a few nuclear power stations by conventional bombs or shells in one or another European country would have catastrophic consequences for whole continent. In short, the world has become too small and fragile for wars and for power politics. It has become truly interdependent. For to keep under control the forces of nature man has mastered the joint efforts of many countries are required. Drawing due lessons from the Chernobyl accident, as well as from other similar occurrences of the recent past in other countries, and approaching the peaceful use of nuclear energy with a sense of responsibility, the Soviet leadership has put forward a four-point programme aimed at strengthening the international regime of safe nuclear power development. These proposals, set forth in Mikhail Gorbachev's May 14 television address, envisage:

First, closer cooperation among all countries engaged in nuclear power development, specifically through the organization of an early warning system and supply of information in the event of accidents or malfunctions at atomic power stations, and the rendering of mutual assistance when dangerous situations emerge. Second, discussions of the entire range of relevant matters at a highly authoritative special international conference under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Third, enhancing the role and possibilities of the IAEA, in particular by increasing its resources and staff. Fourth, active involvement of the U.N. and its specialized agencies (the World

Health Organization, for example) in the effort to ensure the safe development of peaceful nuclear power engineering. The Soviet Union expects that the proposals to strengthen and heighten the role of the IAEA and the other measures to ensure the safe use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes will find support in Washington not only in words, but in deeds. However, the paramount nuclear problem today is not control over the peaceful atom, but the problem of the uncontrolled military atom. "The accident at Chernobyl," Mikhail Gorbachev said, "once again gave an inkling of the abyss into which nuclear war would plunge mankind." Anyone who pressed the "nuclear button" would thereby control not only over the military atom but also his own destiny. Precisely because of this the U.S. strategists' favourite idea of "controlled and considered" use of the U.S. nuclear arsenal is nothing more than an absurdity. Such use is not a way of gaining the upper hand in a conflict, as the U.S. defence secretary says, but the way to launch out on the road to nowhere, the road to the destruction of humanity. Having considered all aspects of the issue of war and peace, the Soviet leadership is firmly convinced that the nuclear weapon holds the threat of extinction over the entire human race. The character of nuclear weapons and the size of their present stockpiles (about 50,000 nuclear warheads with a total yield equivalent to 12 billion tons of conventional explosives) leave no country any hope of being able to protect itself by military-technical means alone, by means of defences however sophisticated and powerful.

Ensuring security is increasingly a political task that can be accomplished only by political means, as was underscored at the 27th Congress of the CPSU. Accordingly, the Soviet Union advanced a far-reaching proposal for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security. Its basic principles were set forth in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress. In the military sphere the fundamental principles are renunciation by the nuclear powers of war -- both nuclear and conventional -- against each other or against third countries; prevention of an arms race in outer space; cessation of all nuclear weapons tests and the total destruction of such weapons; a ban on, and the destruction of, chemical weapons; renunciation of the development of other means of mass annihilation; a strictly controlled lowering of the military potentials of the states; reduction of military budgets, and a number of other measures. In the political sphere -- unconditional respect for the right of each people to choose the ways and forms of its development independently; a just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts; elaboration and implementation of measures aimed at building confidence between states; elaboration of effective methods of preventing international terrorism; and also a set of measures in the economic and humanitarian spheres, including wider international cooperation in giving effect to the political, social and personal rights of people. These proposals have not remained a mere declaration of intent. They have been backed by a series of concrete initiatives aimed at overcoming tendencies towards confrontation in the policies of states, at easing international tension, radical reduction of nuclear and conventional armaments, preventing the arms race from being carried over to new spheres, and strengthening peaceful cooperation in Europe and throughout the world. The first and most important of these initiatives is the concrete 15-year programme for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world set forth in the CPSU general secretary's statement of January 15 this year. This programme, the ultimate objective of which is the ridding of the world of nuclear weapons, calls for the reduction by half in the next 5-8 years of the nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States capable of reaching each other's territory, renunciation of the development and deployment of space-strike weapons, and the subsequent inclusion in this process of Britain, France and other nuclear powers. The latest proposal of this order was submitted by the Soviet delegation at the new round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space

weapons which recently opened in Geneva. It is a draft agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. The Soviet Union has also submitted detailed proposals relating to the prohibition of chemical weapons and the abolition of the stockpiles of these weapons, and to issues that are impeding progress at the Vienna talks on the limitation of arms and armed forces in central Europe. The Soviet delegation at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe is also working actively and constructively to help ensure the early successful conclusion of the conference.

A vivid demonstration of the Soviet Union's dedication to peace and nuclear disarmament is the Soviet Government's decision once again to prolong, until August 6 this year, its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests which entered into force on August 6 last year. Announcing the prolongation of the moratorium, Mikhail Gorbachev again proposed an early meeting with President Reagan with a view to agreeing on the prohibition of nuclear tests. At the same time the CPSU general secretary confirmed his agreement in principle to the next meeting with the U.S. President. Agreed at the Geneva summit in November last year. For this meeting to take place, Mr. Gorbachev stressed, two simple things are needed: a desire to see it produce tangible practical results if only on one or two of the issues that command the attention of the entire world, and an appropriate political atmosphere. Ensuring nuclear security in the world, and primarily, the termination of nuclear tests as the most important and highly symbolic step in this direction, questions relating to the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe, reduction of conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, including the forces of the Soviet Union and the United States, with a simultaneous reduction of operational-tactical nuclear armaments -- these are some of the more or less "simple problems in the complex array of international problems which call for solution by the leaders of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. And if the U.S. leaders are sincere when they declare their readiness to take a new approach to U.S.-Soviet relations, to give an impulse to disarmament, and if they are really concerned about the life and health of the present and future generations, they have every opportunity to confirm this without delay by their concrete actions, by meeting the U.S.S.R. halfway.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTS SPEECH BY FRG'S JOHANNES RAU

LD301605 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] Bonn May 30 TASS--Johannes Rau, the Social Democrats' candidate for the West German chancellor, called for a continued policy of detente in his speech at a European-American conference on security and disarmament here. He stressed the need to end the arms race and to prevent it from spreading into outer space.

Without calling in question West Germany's membership of NATO, Johannes Rau nevertheless said: West Germany will acquire the decree of security it can only when it can formulate, state and hold up its own security interests within the alliance. We are seeking the gradual demilitarization of the East-West conflict and are therefore pursuing a policy of collective security.

The Chernobyl accident graphically demonstrated anew that all of us are living in the same house and that the threat that is common to all of us can only be countered by a policy of collective security. The Europeans in East and West alike have to reckon with one another when it comes to ensuring security and neutralizing technological risks.

To avoid the common danger, there is no alternative to working out methods to settle conflicts peacefully and to pursue a policy of security between the alliances on the basis of a treaty.

We think it necessary to stop the deployment of new weapons for the duration of disarmament talks, Rau continued, and also to renounce continued nuclear weapon tests. Our American allies should understand that it is hardly admissible to conduct talks on nuclear arms reductions during 8 years while constantly producing and testing ever new weapon systems.

The Geneva summit improved the atmosphere for the talks and created favourable preconditions for further dialogue. Yet decisive progress has not been achieved at the talks. That is why we are calling upon both great powers to take care at their second summit to remove obstacles from the road to progressive change.

Rau called for the withdrawal of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles from West Germany and from Western Europe in general, for the elimination of theatre nuclear weapons in Western Europe, for the establishment of non-nuclear zones in the continent and for the abolition of chemical weapons.

Rau voiced worry over the recent U.S. raid on Libya. The U.S. stated intention of not renouncing in future military measures like those taken against Libya is causing much concern, he said.

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU'S DOBRYNIN SPEAKS ON ARMS ISSUES, U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

WA170850 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 86 pp 1-2

[KAZTAG report on speech by A.F. Dobrynin on 20 May in Alma-Ata]

[Excerpts] The Heavy Engineering Plant imeni 60-letiya SSSR was visited on 20 May by CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.F. Dobrynin. He reviewed the shops and chatted with the workers and specialists. On the same day he met with the enterprise collective in the Kazakh State Academy Drama Theater imeni M.O. Auezova.

Those assembled were addressed by CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.F. Dobrynin.

Dear Comrades! I am very glad of the opportunity to visit your plant and talk with the workers, engineers and managers of such complex work and one that is important for the accomplishment of our economic tasks. You will understand, of course, that in such a short time it is difficult or simply impossible to probe into all your problems. But I have endeavored to catch what is most important, as I see it, and what is most essential. I confess that I have a special attitude toward technology and plant affairs: I myself am by education an engineer and worked in my specialty somewhat, briefly, it is true, before the party sent me into diplomatic work. But this is not important.

Comrades! Permit me now to talk to you about international matters. Not simply because by virtue of the assignments which the party has entrusted to me I have for several decades been in contact with foreign policy problems. I believe that these problems are of vital interest now to far from just professional diplomats. I will not be wrong in saying that they disturb literally everyone. And this is understandable: after all, they ultimately all amount to one question -- whether it will be war or peace. We may without exaggeration go even further: It is a question in our time of whether mankind will be able to preserve himself and life on earth or whether it will be plunged into a catastrophe where the nuclear tornado misses no one.

I will say plainly: answering this question is not that simple. Why? Because the truth must be seen -- in international affairs also -- as it is. And this truth is such: The threat of nuclear war remains a reality. And, what is more, it has not yet been possible not only to eliminate it for all time but to seriously move it back even.

The international situation is highly complex. There is every reason for alarm over the state thereof. And our party is speaking candidly about this both to its own people and the peoples of the whole world. But this justified alarm is not a reason for a passive expectation of the worst with a hope for something better. This alarm

should prompt and is prompting totally unprecedented energy of action. In foreign policy matters, as in domestic matters, what is required is the growing dynamism, intensive activity and the increased effectiveness of the measures being implemented in support of peace and disarmament.

In order to operate correctly we must take precisely into account the motives which guide our partners on the international scene, aggressive imperialist circles included.

Apart from certain militarist maniacs nobody, seemingly, wants nuclear war. But acquiring military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries -- the imperialists have a tremendous, unquenched desire here.

I spent a considerable time in the United States as ambassador and may say this: Among the American population there is a broadening understanding of the danger not only of war itself but also of the arms race, but this is not yet being felt in the corridors of power in Washington. Why is this? In short, because some people are doing well financially due to the arms race and would like to earn even more. And it is the interests of these circles that the present U.S. Administration expresses.

The history of interstate relations has taught people what is precisely and laconically expressed by an old Russian saying: "A bad peace is better than a good quarrel." For what is a "bad peace" now? It is a peace armed to the teeth with frankly fantastic weapons capable of reducing the planet to ashes in the most literal meaning of the word. It is a peace which is as yet precariously balancing on the very edge of the abyss. Of course, it is nonetheless better than a "quarrel," that is, war. But how much longer can it balance on the edge?

Weapons are being stockpiled increasingly and they are becoming increasingly sophisticated and destructive, and, consequently, the perfectly real threat that people will prove incapable of controlling them is growing. Whence the conclusion: in questions of war and peace now, in the nuclear age, the significance of a responsible approach to the new problems which it poses is growing.

It is time for everyone to understand that the unchecked stockpiling of monstrous weapons of mass extermination, although there are already more than enough of them in the world, insistently demands of each and everyone on earth, but primarily, of course, of politicians and statesmen a departure from the habits, notions and behavior on the world scene characteristic of the practice of the prenuclear era.

There was recently, as you know, a serious accident at the Chernobyl AES. You all listened, of course, to Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's televised speech.

What happened in Chernobyl is one further stern reminder of the need for new thinking and new policy. Primarily a recognition that modern technology -- the work of human hands -- requires a special attitude lest it turn against man. We have drawn the conclusions for ourselves and emphasize once again the paramount significance of questions of ensuring the reliability of equipment and its safety and discipline, order and organization at every works, particularly where new science and technology achieve ~~amazing~~, all of whose secrets need to have been assimilated entirely, have been introduced.

It needs to be said that in the United States also there was not so long since a serious accident at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Power Station. And, incidentally, it was far from immediately that the world community learned the whole story of this catastrophe. As of the 1970's there have been 151 accidents at nuclear power stations -- and, again, many of them were not reported -- in Western Europe alone. And the

recent Challenger tragedy (when seven American astronauts died) showed that technical malfunctions as a result of this human miscalculation or instance of carelessness or the other are becoming increasingly costly. And what if instruments and equipment fail and what if circumstances fatally converge when it is no longer a question of the peaceful use of nuclear energy or rockets for space exploration but of some new complex military systems? Moreover, if it is no longer a technical but political miscalculation which is made by a statesman, who does not want to understand or is incapable of understanding the very logic of the nuclear age? After all, the nuclear weapons which are already stockpiled are fraught with thousands and thousands of catastrophes far more terrible than Chernobyl.

The Soviet leadership fittingly repudiated, of course, the anti-Soviet campaign launched in the West. But did not confine itself to this. M.S. Gorbachev's speech put forward a constructive program of a serious extension of cooperation within the IAEA framework. It has elicited a broad positive response in both scientific and political circles of all countries. There was no less response to the Soviet Government's decision to extend its moratorium on nuclear explosions until 6 August.

The present "bad peace" by no means safeguards us and all mankind against nuclear war. On the contrary, it is ultimately capable of plunging us into catastrophe. Everyone needs to have the courage to recognize this. Our party confirmed at the 27th congress that we have such courage. And confirmed it not only in words but in deeds.

Yes, comrades, peace is not simply the absence of war. Peace also needs, if you like, to be planned, designed and actively built. And for this we need not only resistance to anti-Soviets but also interaction between all states and between all people of goodwill, whatever the ideological and political views they hold.

The Soviet Union has put forward a specific program for the gradual elimination of weapons of mass annihilation by the year 2000 and proposed that all governments embark in unison on the building of an all-embracing system of international security. We are not about to attack anyone, do not wish to impose by force our views and practices on anyone and do not covet anyone's land. Our party intends doing everything to build a peace that is strong, just and equally secure for all states. For this reason the Soviet Union supports the exclusion of nuclear weapons from arsenals altogether and the confinement of military potential to the limits of a reasonable sufficiency.

The Soviet Union will not, of course, permit anyone to talk to it in the language of force. We do not pretend to greater security than the United States, but will not consent to less. We will most emphatically and firmly cut short all provocations against our country and our people by imperialism. And at the same time we will constantly pursue our policy of consolidating peace and international security.

This, briefly, is the essence of Soviet foreign policy. This was stated unequivocally at the 27th CPSU Congress. Pursuing such a policy in the present complex world is not easy, but our socialist state can have no other policy. We are not about to weaken and retreat from it. And we will not retreat.

Little more than 2 months have elapsed since the congress. But you have obviously noticed that many of the fundamental ideas and proposals contained in the Central Committee Political Report concerning a lessening of the nuclear threat and the building of a lasting peace which is secure for all have already been actualized by the Soviet Government and clothed in specific foreign policy proposals and initiatives. It is a question of the banning and liquidation of chemical weapons, a reduction in conventional arms in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- withdrawal of the navies of the nuclear powers from the Mediterranean, a quest for ways to stabilize and improve the situation in Asia and much else.

Our proposals encompass all spheres of security policy -- military, political, economic and humanitarian. Our initiatives are addressed to the countries of all continents -- primarily Europe, but also Asia, Africa and America. In a word, they are proposals and initiatives of a genuinely all-embracing, global nature. But approaching questions of security in our time differently is impossible. For security, like peace itself, is in the nuclear age indivisible.

And one further matter. The state of Soviet-American relations. It leaves, as it is customary to say diplomatically in such instances, much to be desired. But plainly speaking, these relations are bad and tense. Of course, had Washington the political will, these relations could greatly improve. After all, last fall in Geneva the leaders of the USSR and the United States reached an understanding on an acceleration of the Geneva negotiations and a reduction in nuclear arms, confirmed their subject and purpose, including the prevention of an arms race in space, and recorded in a joint statement that both our countries emphasize the importance of "preventing war between them -- nuclear and conventional." Quite a lot, if, of course, the United States would confirm this statement with actual deeds.

However, this has not happened. You, of course, yourselves know that on no single issue since Geneva has the U.S. Administration moved in the direction agreed there.

What has the answer to us been in connection with the serious set of specific proposals advanced in M.S. Gorbachev's statement aimed at the complete and final elimination of nuclear weapons and a settlement of other world problems? Nothing, it may be said. What the Reagan government has sent us prior to the congress and since are not answers the evasions, a departure from the heart of the matter and elementary demagogery.

I have already mentioned their (sic) reaction to our proposals concerning a banning of nuclear tests. In short, their "logic" amounts to the following: since nuclear weapons exist, we need to continue testing them. Some kind of mockery of logic.

The second round has now begun at the Geneva negotiations. And? The American delegation is once again arriving with the old luggage of unacceptable ideas. Not one proposal, not one glimmer attesting a desire to really move toward an accord, toward disarmament.

But to take the problem of so-called local conflicts? The barbaric attack on Libya, the supercharging of threats against Nicaragua and Syria, supplies of modern weapons to the bandits in Angola and Afghanistan, everything indicates that U.S. brigandage in the world is increasing and that it bears the main responsibility for regional conflicts.

And, of course, all this is doing direct damage to the dialogue between the USSR and the United States. The Soviet Union cannot and will not close its eyes to these excesses. We state this frankly. And Soviet-American relations cannot develop in isolation from how the U.S. Administration behaves on the international scene in general.

In world affairs, in relations with the United States included, the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government do not allow themselves to be guided by emotions alone and to subordinate policy to feelings and they proceed from the interests of their country, the interests of world socialism and the interests of general peace. But at the same time they are not losing vigilance either and are not allowing us to be caught unawares and to a threat to our security to be created under the cover of disarmament negotiations.

The USSR supports the development of normal, good relations with the United States on, of course, an equal and mutually profitable basis. In our view it is very important that even in the present situation there be a dialogue between us and at all levels, the top level included, furthermore. We proceed from the fact that, albeit not everything, of course, a good deal depends on the state, level and quality of Soviet-American relations. And today both the state and prospects of Soviet-American relations are determined primarily by progress or the lack of such in what is most important, namely, movement along the path of limiting the arms race, along the path of a revival of detente and the creation of trust between the countries.

The Soviet leadership is also approaching from this viewpoint the question of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's transatlantic trip. Understanding thereon was reached in Geneva. But, after all, everyone can see that since Geneva Washington has embarked on the path of actually undermining all the Geneva accords. For this reason the Soviet leadership believes, first, that a new Soviet-American top-level meeting may take place only if the proper international atmosphere takes shape and if the moral-political spirit of Geneva is revived. And, second, there will be a point to such a meeting if it leads to real improvements and practical results in halting the arms race and in disarmament. Otherwise why go, why waste time on empty discussion? This is what Comrade M.S. Gorbachev said plainly during his recent conversation with the prominent American businessman A. Hammer.

And, of course, now I have to tell you that the prospects for such a meeting have deteriorated. How things will proceed depends on Washington. We will see. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, will not depart from its policy of peace, detente and disarmament or from rebuffing all the aggressive intrigues of U.S. ruling circles.

In all countries, albeit to a varying extent, the forces of the self-preservation of mankind or, as Comrade M.S. Gorbachev evocatively put it, the potential for peace, prudence and good will are growing. The components of this potential are diverse. They include the increasingly strong might and growing authority of the socialist community, the many dozens of states of Asia, Africa and Latin America which are linking problems of their development with those of disarmament, the international communist and workers movement and, finally, the peace movements, which have for the first time in history, perhaps, become such a powerful independent factor influencing the international situation.

And do not be surprised: this potential also includes representatives of the ruling class in the capitalist countries. You understand -- they wish to live not as we do, but they do want to live. The arms race, of course, continues to be for many of them a profitable business, but nuclear war would not be good business -- its murderous consequences would bypass neither the worker nor the millionaire.

Solidarity is not a festive word. It is an indispensable condition of the success of any work. Both in every labor collective and on the international scene also. The solidarity of people, parties and movements united by one great goal -- doing away with the nuclear threat forever -- is a comprehensible and attractive idea, which is prompting to act in concert communists, social democrats, dozens of emergent countries and all who wish to preserve life on earth. As far as our party and our people are concerned, of course, comrades, we will spare no efforts in the fight against nuclear war.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU'S DOBRYNIN WRITES ON DISARMAMENT, DEVELOPMENT

PM091040 Paris LE MONDE in French 4 Jun 86 p 3

[APN attributed article by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Dobrynin:
"Disarmament for Development!"]

[Excerpts] In our age there is no alternative to ending the arms race, just as there is no alternative to maintaining and strengthening peace. Socialism's ideal is a world without weapons and violence, a world in which all people will freely choose their path of development and their way of life.

Mankind has several complex and difficult objectives to achieve. But there is one extremely urgent objective: to prevent a nuclear war.

One sometimes has the impression that some representatives of the developing countries, which are fully absorbed in their internal problems (which are indeed difficult), underestimate this extremely urgent objective. Unless we succeed in preventing a nuclear war, what point will there be in all the efforts made in the struggle for national independence and the social progress of people? Yet an end to the arms race would enable the whole world to release vast resources that could be devoted in particular to the developing countries. The struggle against the threat of nuclear war is also the struggle for the development of countries and people who have gained their liberation.

In a context in which attention to nuclear problems has been stepped up, the Soviet Government, after assessing all the circumstances connected with the security of its people and all mankind, decided to decree a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests until 6 August -- the anniversary of the dropping of the first atomic bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima in 1945. That bomb killed hundreds of thousands of people. The Soviet Union has proposed the complete destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons; a halt to the production of other means of mass destruction, particularly in space; the dissolution of military groups; and the reduction of military budgets.

Initiatives aimed at finding political solutions to the conflicts in various regions of the world fit perfectly into the Soviet program for strengthening peace and setting up an international security system.

Preliminary Talks on Afghanistan

The strengthening of security in Asia and the Pacific is very important aspect of our foreign policy. The Soviet Government has proposed wide-ranging measures aimed at establishing a constructive dialogue among the states of the Asian and Pacific region, at working together to find ways of settling disputes among them and setting up close and mutually advantageous cooperation. The combined efforts of all the states in this vast region would make it possible to convene in the future an Asian conference that would help set up a reliable security system in Asia and to create nuclear-free and chemical weapon-free zones there. We are also proposing that preparations be made for a conference of Pacific countries to examine questions relating to security and cooperation. The Soviet Union supports the efforts made by the governments and pacifists in the countries situated in the southern part of the Pacific with a view to creating a nuclear-free zone.

Cooperation With the Developing Countries

We are working tirelessly to normalize the situation in the Mediterranean, which dangerously deteriorated recently following the aggressive actions of U.S. militarism. Advocating that this region be turned into a stable zone of peace and cooperation, the USSR has proposed the withdrawal of the Soviet and U.S. fleets from the Mediterranean. At the same time our country proposed convening a representative conference, similar to the European conference, where it would be possible to examine all questions relating to the consolidation of peace in this region, including confidence-building measures, which have already proved their worth in world practice.

The USSR consistently supports the developing countries' legitimate demands for the restructuring of international economic relations on the basis of just and democratic principles. The convening of world congress on the problems of economic security would undoubtedly contribute to economic decolonization and to an improvement in international economic relations.

We are firmly convinced that the principle imposed by imperialism (armament instead of development) should be replaced by the following principle: disarmament for development! This is in particular the aim of the Soviet Union's proposal to reduce military budgets and to use some of the money thus released to help the developing countries.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

TASS CITES PRC'S HU--London, 12 Jun--Hu Yaobang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, gave a press conference here at the end of his official visit to Britain. Touching upon the situation in the world, he noted the increased tension in the international arena. Going on to talk about the well-known Chinese concept of the "inevitability of a new world war" put forward more than 10 years ago, the general secretary of the CPC Central Committee called it "exaggerated and obsolete," adding that the concept should be amended taking the growth of antiwar forces and movements into account. The PRC, Hu Yaobang stressed, "will not participate in an arms race, much less a nuclear arms race, under any circumstances." We advocate, he pointed out, the general prohibition and complete destruction of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and space arms. As for defense construction, China "does not intend to spend its limited foreign exchange reserves on large purchases of weapons and military hardware." [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 86 First Edition p 5] /8309

CPSU DISARMAMENT BROCHURE--The CPSU Central Committee's PRAVDA publishing house has published the Seventh Edition of the mass-circulation brochure "Disarmament--The Order of the Time." Like the previous issues, it contains documents and material devoted to the problems of the struggle against the arms race and for disarmament. The brochure opens with relevant documents and material from the 27th CPSU Congress. It also contains other official documents, speeches by Soviet leaders, and PRAVDA editorial articles published in the newspaper in the period since October 1985. The new material cogently demonstrates the consistent, purposeful foreign policy line taken by the CPSU aimed at reviving detente, achieving disarmament, preventing the militarization of space, and strengthening international security. The brochure is intended for party workers, lecturers in international affairs, propaganda workers, political information workers in the political education network, and also a broad range of readers with an interest in questions of the Soviet state's foreign policy. [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 86 First Edition p 4] /8309

CSO: 5200/1436

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

30 JULY 1986